Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARJGO_111025**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Placenta Previa associated factors; Retrospective study**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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 **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. **Is the manuscript important for the scientific community?** ○ The manuscript addresses an important topic related to placenta previa and its associated factors, particularly the impact of previous caesarean sections. Understanding these risk factors is crucial for maternal and neonatal health, making the manuscript relevant to the scientific community. 2. **Is the title of the article suitable?** ○ The title is suitable as it clearly reflects the focus of the research on placenta previa and its associated factors. 3. **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** ○ The abstract provides a good overview of the study, but it could be more comprehensive by including specific numerical findings to enhance clarity. 4. **Are subsections and the structure of the manuscript appropriate?** ○ The subsections and overall structure are appropriate. However, consider incorporating a clear statement of the research objectives in the introduction for improved structure. 5. **Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** ○ The manuscript appears scientifically sound, but ensure that specific statistical methods used for data analysis are included in the methodology for transparency. 6. **Are the references sufficient and recent?** ○ The references are sufficient, but it's advisable to ensure the inclusion of the most recent studies to strengthen the literature review.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Assess and revise the language to ensure it meets scholarly communication standards. Pay attention to grammar, syntax, and overall clarity.	
Optional/General comments	Consider providing more detailed interpretations of the results in the results and discussion sections. Discuss potential clinical implications and address limitations more explicitly.	

Review Form 1.7

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Amanuel Admasu Yayna**
Department, University & Country	**Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia**