

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_108123
Title of the Manuscript:	The Association Between Placenta Previa in Pregnant Women with Previous Caesarian Section
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)
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. There is really nothing new. It has already been firmly established that caesarean section is a risk factor for placenta praevia</p> <p>2. The title is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>4. There are problems with subsections and structure as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective: Should not stand alone but be part of the concluding statements in the introduction</li> <li>Results: There are unnecessarily too many tables and figures</li> <li>The information in Figures 1-5 and tables 1,3-7 can be merged to one table</li> <li>The information in table 2 can be written in prose. A table is not required</li> <li>Discussion: There are too many figures in this section which are already in the result section. It seems like repeating the results</li> </ul> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient but very old and need to be upgraded. Also the referencing style especially for the books seem incorrect</p>	<p>Since table 4–7 and figure 5 each showed different data, the two sets cannot be combined.</p> <p>Most of the reference are old in google and I have updated two references.</p>
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>		

## PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	