

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_124547
Title of the Manuscript:	Ultrasound Measurement of Liver Length During Pregnancy: Analyzing Correlations with Demographic Factors in 559 Women.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript addresses a relevant and important topic in obstetric and maternal health — ultrasonographic liver measurement in pregnancy. Liver imaging is critical for diagnosing and monitoring liver-related emergencies and co-morbid diseases that may arise during pregnancy. The study design is clear, and the statistical methods used seem appropriate for the research question. However, there are certain areas that need improvement to enhance the clarity and impact of the paper.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	My recommendation for alternative title "The cross-sectional ultrasound study of liver size in pregnancy with demographic correlations in Nigerian women"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is generally clear and provides a good overview of the study, but there are some areas that could be improved for clarity and completeness. Here are my suggestions: Add a brief statement on why liver measurement in pregnancy is important, especially in the context of potential clinical outcomes. Methodology: You might consider mentioning the gestational ages of the participants, as that could be relevant in interpreting liver size and its relationship with pregnancy. Instead of "statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$," you could specify the tests used for correlation. Results: The range of liver length measurements (12.0-29.0 cm) seems very wide. If this is correct, perhaps clarifying any relevant clinical implications of this variation would strengthen the abstract. The correlation value ($r = 0.503$) is reported, but it might be helpful to describe the strength of the correlation (e.g., moderate or strong). In finaly, you could strengthen the conclusion by discussing the potential clinical significance of the correlation between liver size and parity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript seem appropriate and generally well-organized for a study of the type.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. First, it uses a well-established and non-invasive imaging technique, ultrasonography, which is widely accepted for measuring liver size. The study's large sample size of 559 participants strengthens the statistical power, and the inclusion and exclusion criteria, such as excluding women with liver disease or medication use, help reduce confounding factors. The clear correlation analysis using Pearson's coefficient, particularly the statistically significant finding between parity and liver length, aligns with established physiological principles regarding the liver's adaptive changes during pregnancy. Additionally, the manuscript acknowledges the limitations, improving transparency and suggesting directions for future research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references listed in the manuscript span a broad range of relevant topics, including liver anatomy, hormonal and physiological changes during pregnancy, imaging techniques like ultrasound and MRI, and sonographic liver measurements in various populations. This shows a solid foundation in both clinical and imaging literature. However, there are a few points to consider regarding sufficiency and recency: Several references, such as Cramer et al. (1992) and Kratzer et al. (2003), are older studies. While these may still be valid for	

Review Form 3

	<p>fundamental knowledge, it could be beneficial to include more recent studies to reflect advancements in liver imaging techniques, especially in pregnancy, and newer findings on liver physiology during pregnancy.</p> <p>Authors have two references on MRI (Gatta et al., 2021 and 2022), which are relevant for imaging, but since this manuscript focuses on ultrasound, they may want to balance this with more current ultrasound-based research.</p> <p>If authors will to add studies that focus on ultrasound-based liver measurements in pregnant women across different ethnicities or comparing measurements in different stages of pregnancy could be helpful.</p> <p>If authors have access to recent reviews or meta-analyses on liver size and pregnancy-related changes from 2020-2024, those could also be valuable additions.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are a few areas where improvements could be made for clarity, conciseness, and formality. Some sentences are quite long and could be split into shorter sentences for better readability, especially in sections where multiple ideas are presented at once.</p> <p>... This study aims to investigate the ultrasonographic findings of liver length in pregnant women... This is fine, but scholarly writing sometimes benefits from slightly more formal phrasing, such as: "This study seeks to examine ultrasonographic measurements of liver length in pregnant women..."</p> <p>As for me, authors must ensure consistent use of past tense when referring to the study's findings and methodology (e.g., "The study found" instead of "The study finds").</p> <p>Minor grammar and punctuation checks could refine the overall presentation (e.g., ensuring that commas and conjunctions are appropriately placed in complex sentences).</p> <p>Overall, with a few revisions, the article is appropriate for scholarly communication and presents the research clearly and concisely.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Here are my thoughts and suggestions regarding the abstract, results, and the structure of the paper:</p> <p>Abstract. The abstract is clear and well-organized. It effectively outlines the study's aim, methodology, and key findings, including the significant correlation between liver size and parity.</p> <p>Suggestion: Consider highlighting the clinical relevance of these findings, particularly how they can influence routine prenatal care and management of liver-related conditions during pregnancy.</p> <p>Introduction. The introduction establishes the importance of studying liver size during pregnancy, mentioning potential physiological changes and conditions like HELLP syndrome. It provides adequate background on liver function during pregnancy.</p> <p>Suggestion: Expanding on the clinical significance of liver measurement in prenatal care could strengthen the rationale for the study.</p> <p>Methods. The methodology is well-explained, particularly in how liver measurements were taken. The exclusion criteria (such as excluding those with liver diseases) are appropriate.</p> <p>Suggestion: A brief mention of any quality control measures for ultrasound measurements (e.g., interobserver variability) could add more reliability to the findings.</p> <p>Results. The results are presented clearly, particularly the significant correlation between liver length and parity. The data collection and statistical analysis are solid.</p> <p>Suggestion: It may help to provide more context about the wide range of liver lengths (12.0 to 29.0 cm). Are there any specific factors accounting for such variability?</p> <p>Discussion. The discussion effectively situates the study within existing literature and provides meaningful comparisons with past findings. It highlights the role of parity in liver size but contrasts with previous studies regarding age and BMI.</p> <p>Suggestion: Expanding on potential physiological mechanisms behind liver enlargement with increasing parity would provide more depth. Additionally, considering any potential confounding factors that may have influenced the findings could be helpful.</p> <p>Conclusion. The conclusion reiterates the key findings about parity's effect on liver size and emphasizes the importance of ultrasonography in prenatal care.</p> <p>Suggestion: It may be beneficial to suggest specific clinical applications or protocols based on these findings.</p> <p>Limitations. The limitations are well-stated, acknowledging the study's cross-sectional design and the exclusion of certain populations. The discussion of not including postpartum liver measurements is particularly insightful.</p> <p>Suggestion: Consider recommending future studies with larger sample sizes from diverse geographical regions to validate these findings.</p> <p>Overall, the study is well-structured and provides new insights into the relationship between liver size and parity during pregnancy. Expanding on the clinical implications in prenatal care and discussing physiological mechanisms in more detail could further strengthen the manuscript.</p> <p>The manuscript does not seem to raise significant ethical concerns, but there are a few points to consider. In research, ethical issues can arise in different ways, and it is important to address them proactively.</p> <p>There is no mention of how the researchers ensured the confidentiality and privacy of the participants' personal information, including their medical data. Although anonymization of data is typically standard practice, it would be good to confirm that this was done according to ethical guidelines.</p> <p>The exclusion of women with pre-existing liver conditions or those on medications affecting liver function is clearly stated. However, ethical guidelines would expect this exclusion to be justified in order to protect participants from harm and maintain the study's focus. It</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>would also be important to ensure that this exclusion did not result in any form of discrimination.</p> <p>The manuscript mentions that the study was approved by the research ethical committee, which is a positive indicator of adherence to ethical guidelines.</p> <p>The study seems low-risk because ultrasound is a non-invasive procedure, and the study focuses on healthy pregnant women. As long as the participants were informed of any potential risks (even minor ones) and the benefits were made clear, the ethical balance appears appropriate.</p> <p>The study does not seem to involve any unnecessary risk to the participants, and the focus on a non-invasive technique like ultrasonography is ethical. In summary, the study appears to address ethical requirements appropriately, but clarifying how privacy and confidentiality were handled could strengthen the manuscript.</p> <p>The manuscript does not appear to have any explicit mention of competing interests or conflicts of interest. Since no statement is included in the text provided, it is advisable to ensure that a section addressing competing interests is added if required by the journal's guidelines. It would be best to check whether the authors need to declare any competing interests and include a formal statement confirming the absence or presence of such conflicts in the manuscript.</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dmytro Konkov
Department, University & Country	National Pirogov Memorial Medical University, Ukraine