

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_86792
Title of the Manuscript:	A cross-sectional comparative study to observe the obstetric complication associated with extreme (<18 - >35) maternal age.
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.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>Methodology: tools description needs to be elaborated. Institute ethics committee approval- not mentioned. Ethical issues and anonymity not addressed. Method of data collection needs clarity. Researcher may know well; it is not communicated to the audience. Sample size calculation. Sampling technique. – methodology needs major revision Results: tables foot note – test name need to be added for p value. percentage only mentioned. (table 1& 3) Discussion : subjective reference like “ we” can be avoided , can address researchers</p> <p>There are several studies which show similar figures to our study like a study conducted at tertiary level hospital in Pakistan found hemorrhage to be commonest cause of maternal deaths⁷</p> <p>There is only on reference mentioned . discussion is lengthy and talking about too many details, its not objective based. If the researcher had other objectives, kindly include or reduce the discussion pertaining to the current objective.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract : methods statistical tests were wrongly mentioned: non parametric test is mentioned as parametric. Some error in the line Introduction: reference 12 -talking about other issues. Not directly related. Only related points can be written. last line of the introduction says about current study or reference study, its not clear.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Very good paper. Even though so many limitations mentioned, researchers could have addressed some.</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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Ethical committee approval not mentioned</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kavitha R R
Department, University & Country	JIPMER, India