

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_129567
Title of the Manuscript:	A Cross-Sectional Study For The Impact Of Primary Caesarean Section On Future Pregnancy Outcome At Rural Based Tertiary Care Centre, Gujarat, India.
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article submitted on primary CS on future outcome of pregnancy is important and suits the present requirement as there is rising rate of opting of women toward CS rather than normal vaginal delivery. The finding of such more studies can help in developing guidelines and policy development.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Article title is suitable but some Letter case should be made small. Example: A Cross-Sectional Study for the Impact of Primary Caesarean Section on Future Pregnancy Outcome at Rural based Tertiary Care Centre, Gujarat, India.	
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.	Abstract is comprehensive, Keywords like VBAC mentioned in result and discussion should be mentioned in Keyword section of abstract or either such full form should be written complete into the article.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct and statistics support the given findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some more references should be added into discussion portion where it support the present findings.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is correct.	
Optional/General comments	The objectives can be divided into 2 parts rather than one single objective. Result and discussion: The study duration is mentioned as 10 month rather the month name should be written(First line) Table no. 3: Scar dehiscence (The spelling of dehiscence) Table no. 4: No requirment (The spelling of Requirement) Study further recommendation can be added into the conclusion.	

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anchal Gupta
Department, University & Country	King George's Medical University, Lucknow, India