

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Hematology Research Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AHRJ_115099 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | HEMOSTATIC PARAMETERS IN WOMEN WITH OBSTETRIC HEMORRHAGE |
| Type of the 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. The manuscript conforms to norms for the structure and soundness of research, but there are a few places where corrections should be made, which are pointed out later in the report. 2. Title is concise, attractive and mentions main aims, 3. The abstract is generally not well-written and does not present all important points (such as the significant value between the test group and the control). 4. The structure and the template of the article should be improved. 5. No 6. Yes 7. The introduction provides a good background for the study, provides a rationale, and defines the aims of the study, but not well stated. | Noted Effected revision Done and revised |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The quality of the written English still needs improving. | ok |
| Optional/General comments | 1. The paper has been somewhat improved. However, the paper still has some issues that should be corrected before publication, as detailed in this report. 2. Some of the medical hemostatic literature is not related to the manuscript and should be removed. So, the author should discuss only his parameters done in the study not in the literature. 3. Results are not well-written, only present as tables express the main important findings. | Noted |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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> | |