

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRGY_88287
Title of the Manuscript:	Prospective Comparison of Rectal Misoprostol versus Oxytocin Infusion for Prevention of Post-Caesarean Section Primary Postpartum Hemorrhage.
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijrrgy.com/index.php/IJRRGY/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Where tools of data collection</b>  <b>Where procedure or field work explanation to implement the study</b>  <b>Where Ethical consideration while implementing the study</b>  <b>Aim not completely achieved</b>	This was a prospective study done among paaturients to test the efficacy of rectal misoprostol versus intravenous Oxytocin the prevention of primary post- partum haemorrhage after Caesarean section. The subjects were drawn from parturients at 'The Federal Centre, Yenagoa, a tertiary hospital in Nigeria. There was no field work in the study. The ethical considerations were taken care of as the consents of the participants were sought and obtained. Secondly, the Ethical Committee of the institution opinion on this study was sought and obtained. The Authors believed the aim of the study was achieved because the trial drug, misoprostol was as effective as oxytocin, so in the course of the study, he group that blindly receive the trial drug misoprostol were not at a disadvantage a misoprostol was found to be as effective as oxytocin as a uterotonic..
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	Change some wards Delete and add some wards Acceptance: The paper can be accepted after making .modification suggested by reviewer	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	the manuscript clear, relevant for the field and presented in a well-structured manner. the cited references mostly recent publications (within the last 5 years) and relevant the manuscript's results reproducible based on the details given in the methods section the figures/tables/images/schemes appropriate , they properly show the data , they easy to interpret and understand , the data interpreted appropriately and consistently throughout the manuscript the conclusions consistent with the evidence and arguments presented. Plaigiarized content 20% unique 80% <a href="https://www.prepostseo.com/plagiarism-checker-download-report">https://www.prepostseo.com/plagiarism-checker-download-report</a>	

### 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)	