Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Medicine and Health**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJMAH_126862**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Maternal and Foetal Outcomes in Full-Term Pregnancies with Abnormal Amniotic Fluid Index**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the prevalence and impact of abnormal amniotic fluid levels—polyhydramnios and oligohydramnios—on maternal and neonatal outcomes. By detailing the maternal and fetal risk factors associated with each condition, the study underscores the clinical relevance of early identification and management of amniotic fluid abnormalities, which can potentially reduce complications. The manuscript also compares findings with previous studies, which adds to its value by contextualizing the results within a broader body of research. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on a critical aspect of perinatal care, though the discussion could benefit from deeper analysis of contributing factors and regional variations to enhance understanding and applicability for diverse clinical settings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title of the article appears suitable as it clearly reflects the study's focus on the outcomes of pregnancies complicated by abnormal amniotic fluid levels (polyhydramnios and oligohydramnios).	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a general overview of the study, but there are some areas where it could be enhanced for clarity and comprehensiveness. Currently, it gives a brief introduction, study purpose, methodology, and findings, but additional details about the study's scope, sample size, and key results would improve its completeness. Revised Abstract Example: "This study investigates the maternal and fetal outcomes associated with polyhydramnios and oligohydramnios in 60 cases of pregnancy. The prevalence of polyhydramnios was 2% and oligohydramnios was 5.33%. Common maternal complications included preeclampsia, postpartum hemorrhage, and gestational hypertension, while fetal outcomes included low APGAR scores, low birth weight, and NICU admissions. Our findings suggest that ultrasound and Doppler assessments are crucial in identifying high-risk pregnancies and making appropriate delivery decisions to improve maternal and fetal outcomes."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript appears to be generally appropriate, as it follows the typical format for a clinical research article, with clearly defined sections such as **Introduction**, **Materials and Methods**, **Results**, **Discussion**, **Conclusion**, and **References**.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness in several key areas. Firstly, it is based on a well-defined clinical study with a clear focus on the outcomes associated with polyhydramnios and oligohydramnios, which are important complications in obstetrics. The research is grounded in relevant literature, and the methodology used—such as ultrasound and Doppler assessments at or after 37 weeks—reflects standard clinical practices for assessing amniotic fluid and fetal well-being. The findings, especially regarding maternal and neonatal outcomes such as preeclampsia, low APGAR scores, and NICU admissions, align with previously published studies, reinforcing the credibility of the results. Additionally, the manuscript provides a comprehensive discussion of the findings, comparing them with relevant studies, which adds depth to the analysis. The sample size of 60 cases, while not large, is appropriate for this study design, and the inclusion of both polyhydramnios and oligohydramnios as study variables offers valuable insight into the clinical significance of amniotic fluid abnormalities. Overall, the study's methodology, results, and comparisons to existing literature contribute to its scientific validity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	The references in this manuscript appear to be sufficient in supporting the research, with a range of studies cited that cover both the clinical aspects of polyhydramnios and oligohydramnios as well as the use of ultrasound and Doppler assessments in pregnancy management. However, there are some areas where more recent references could further strengthen the manuscript. Specifically, studies on the latest advancements in prenatal diagnostic tools, new management protocols for abnormal amniotic fluid, and recent cohort studies on maternal and neonatal outcomes	

	could be useful. Additionally, more recent systematic reviews or meta-analyses on polyhydramnios and oligohydramnios could provide a more comprehensive overview of the current evidence. For example, recent studies from 2020-2024 on: • New technologies in prenatal screening for amniotic fluid volume abnormalities • Updated findings on the long-term maternal and fetal outcomes of polyhydramnios and oligohydramnios • Advances in management practices for pregnancies complicated by these conditions These updates would ensure the manuscript is up-to-date with the latest findings and clinical practices.	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas where clarity and grammatical precision could be improved. The manuscript is technically sound, but some sentences are somewhat complex or could benefit from rephrasing to enhance readability and comprehension. For example, there are instances where punctuation or transitions between ideas could be smoother. A thorough proofread to correct minor errors and improve sentence structure is recommended.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, this manuscript presents a well-organized and informative study on the perinatal outcomes of polyhydramnios and oligohydramnios, which are significant conditions in obstetrics. The findings contribute to understanding the clinical implications of abnormal amniotic fluid volumes and their association with maternal and fetal complications. However, some sections could benefit from clearer language and more precise phrasing to enhance readability and scientific clarity. In addition, while the manuscript references relevant studies, expanding the reference list with more recent research could strengthen the manuscript's impact and relevance. With minor revisions to improve grammar, clarity, and reference breadth, this paper has the potential to make a valuable contribution to the literature on obstetric complications and perinatal outcomes.	

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:	**Olatunji Ogunnubi**
Department, University & Country	**United Kingdom**