

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)
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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 1. There is really nothing new. It has already been firmly established that caesarean section is a risk factor for placenta praevia 2. The title is suitable 3. The abstract is comprehensive 4. There are problems with subsections and structure as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Objective: Should not stand alone but be part of the concluding statements in the introductionResults: There are unnecessarily too many tables and figuresThe information in Figures 1-5 and tables 1,3-7 can be merged to one tableThe information in table 2 can be written in prose. A table is not requiredDiscussion: There are too many figures in this section which are already in the result section. It seems like repeating the results 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct 6. The references are sufficient but very old and need to be upgraded. Also the referencing style especially for the books seem incorrect	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 The language quality is suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amaka N Ocheke
Department, University & Country	University of Jos, Nigeria