

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_80889
Title of the Manuscript:	Maternal Mid-Trimester Placental Growth Factor and Uterine Artery Doppler Velocimetry in Evolution of Pre-Eclampsia
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

## Review Form 1.6

### 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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Patients and methods:</b> Please, rewrite the reagent description for clarity. The use of pictures and/or images could be of help.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Was standardization done for the instruments used?</li> <li>- There was no explanation for head and neck, chest, heart and in addition, lower limb examination.</li> </ul>	<p>done</p> <p>done</p> <p>done</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Introduction:</b> The 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph on page 3 could be written as “There is growing evidence that an imbalance in certain factors released from the placenta and maternal endothelium, including PIGF (placental growth factor), sFlt-1 (soluble Fms-like tyrosine kinase 1), and sEng (soluble Endoglin), are associated with the onset of the disorder” for clarity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Page 4, paragraph 1 sentence 2 could be written as “The angiogenic Imbalance between PIGF and sFlt-1 has a pivotal role in the Pathogenesis of the disease, and their ratio is, thus, a useful tool in its Prediction. PIGF is abnormally low in women with preeclampsia as compared to their gestational age-matched controls.</li> <li>- Page 4, paragraph 4, sentence 1 could be written as “Moreover, Doppler ultrasound is a crucial tool in the management of high-risk pregnancies.</li> </ul> <p><b>Patients and methods:</b> The first sentence is too long. Please, break into smaller sentences with appropriate punctuation marks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The second sentence could be written as “Each case who participated in the present study was fully informed of the nature of the disease and the diagnostic procedures.</li> <li>- Part of the exclusion criteria is – Multiple gestation. Is there a reason for not adding Asthma as one of the chronic diseases?</li> <li>- Investigations: Please, break the first sentence into smaller using appropriate punctuation marks for easy understanding.</li> <li>- Test and procedure: Sentence 7 could be written as “The content of the wells was shaken out and the wells were rinsed 3 times with diluted wash solution (400µl per well) and struck sharply on absorbent paper to remove residual droplets.</li> </ul> <p><b>Statistics:</b> There was appropriate use of statistical tests</p> <p><b>Results:</b> Well outlines with good tables and graphs. They however, may need to be more legible. Table 5 on page 13, the addition of number of cases with birth weight <math>\geq 2,500\text{g}</math> should be 1 not 0 for the 5% in the bracket.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Though, this was started with markers and tests which were not discussed in the introduction, the discussion became robust towards the end. There is need to correct typo errors and shorten long sentences with appropriate use of punctuation marks to ensure clarity of statements.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Well, put together. The last sentence could be rephrased as “The sensitivity or prediction is increased by adding serum marker PIGF; the combination provides an increase in the ability of prediction and determination compared to when used individually”.</p> <p><b>References:</b> Majority are well written and within 10 years which is commendable, however, there is need to adjust reference number 1.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Changed.</li> <li>- Changed.</li> <li>- Changed.</li> <li>- Edited.</li> <li>- Changed.</li> <li>- done</li> <li>- Edited.</li> <li>- Changed.</li> <li>- done</li> <li>- Changed from 0 to 1 in Table 5.</li> <li>- Changed.</li> <li>- done</li> </ul>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Generally, this is a good study. Please, put into practice so as to reduce the mortality rate from this condition in women.	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	Nil