

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMMR_81788 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Correlation between late second and third trimester placental thickness detected by ultrasound and gestational age in normal and IUGR pregnancies |
| 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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | I have reviewed the article "Correlation between late second and third trimester placental thickness detected by ultrasound and gestational age in normal and IUGR pregnancies" submitted to Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research. The article has already been written nicely. It provides evidence that the mean placental thickness was steadily increased with increased gestational age both IUGR and normal fetal weight cases. In addition, In the majority of gestational age groups, the mean placental thickness was lower in IUGR than that their normal weight counterparts. Based on the quality of the article, I recommend publishing it after addressing a minor revision. | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>1) Abstract and introduction are good. In the introduction.</p> <p>2)The drafting of materials and methods is well done and schematized. Punctuation should be revised.</p> <p>3)The current form of Conclusions is a little simple. It would be better to expand it with more essential details.</p> <p>4)Please double check the whole manuscript for potential grammar errors and typos, especially in the materials and methods section.</p> <p>5)The English writing needs further proofreading. There are still some linguistic errors and vague descriptions remaining in the manuscript.</p> | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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: | Donatella caserta. |
| Department, University & Country | Sapienza University of Rome, Italy |