

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80095
Title of the Manuscript:	SUBCHORIONIC HAEMAORRHAGE IN FIRST TRIMESTER AND ITS EFFECTS ON PREGNANCY OUTCOME
Type of the 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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	<p>Dear authors, I appreciate this invitation, however this article has several weaknesses, as quoted below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The authors declare "This study is done with a aim to find how subchorionic haemorrhage affects pregnancy outcome", but this article does not investigate this, only quote some possibilities. 57 pregnancies were include, I wonder if authors can provide the sample size calculation. The authors included singleton viable pregnancy from 6 weeks to 12 weeks gestation – it would be important to define the exact moment in which subchorionic haemorrhage (SH) was revealed. We have articles that demonstrate after 8 weeks with no clinical vaginal haemorrhage, there is less obstetrical complications. Size of subchorionic - beside percentage involvement of gestational sac it would be of interest to measure the volume of SH. Exclusion criteria mentioned the exclusion of High risk pregnancy (preeclampsia, anaemia, bad obstetrics history, GDM, infertility conception), but the authors included 14 women with previous abortion and 2 women with previous IUFD I suggest to include the full name of IUFD also below the table 1 The authors mentioned this is a observational study. The way the article has been written, it seems a series of cases. We can not identify statistical analysis. Several references are not related with topic of interest This study is underpower and no allow us to conclude properly 	
Minor REVISION comments	The references need to be updated. Several references are not related with topic of interest.	
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:	Patricia El Beitune
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Health Sciences of Porto Alegre, Brazil