

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_77174
Title of the Manuscript:	Trans Vaginal versus Trans Abdominal Ultrasound Guided Embryo Transfer in in vitro Fertilization and Intra Cytoplasmic Sperm Injection (IVF-ICSI)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: The author must present the major finding that is relevant to the objective first and then the additional finding. The keywords must be revised according to MeSH.</p> <p>Introduction: The author must describe the reason for conducting this research more clearly and orderly. Some context is incomplete such as "compared ET with and without Trans abdominal ultrasound (TAUS) guidance"</p> <p>Method: The author needs to specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria. The number and stage of embryos that were transferred. Please separately describe the process of embryo transfer (TAUS and TVUS) in details. How many times the author insert vaginal probe? What is the definition of clinical pregnancy? The sample size calculation should be provided.</p> <p>Statistic: As mention in result.</p> <p>Result: The author can combine table 1,2,3, and 4 to one table and some parameter in table 1 such as occupation and residency can be omitted. If the results are not reached statistic significant, the report of 95% confidence interval might consider unnecessary. The author should indicate the statistic used in each table and can omit the word 'P is significant when < 0.05 and *: significant as P value < 0.05' because it has mentioned in the part of statistic already.</p> <p>Discussion: The author should discuss the finding that correspond to the objective of the study first and give the explanation for the difference or similarity when compare with previous studies. The implication must be stated in further step. Finally, the strength and limitation should be mentioned. Please rewrite and check the spelling and grammar.</p> <p>Conclusion: Accept.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Pallop Pongsuthirak</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Buddhachinaraj Hospital, Thailand</i>