

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_85146
Title of the Manuscript:	Ultrasonographic assessment of third trimester fetal kidney length as a measure of gestational age in growth restricted fetuses
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>ORIGINALITY: (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Does the paper clearly point out differences from related research? Yes</li><li>- Are the problems or approaches new? yes</li></ul> <p>For example, does the paper: address a new problem or one that has not been studied in much depth? yes</p> <p>introduce an interesting research paradigm? yes</p> <p>introduce an area that appears promising, or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives? yes</p> <p>SIGNIFICANCE (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Is the work important? yes</li><li>- Does it advance the state of the art? yes</li><li>- Does the paper stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view? yes</li></ul> <p>TECHNICAL QUALITY (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Is the paper technically sound, with compelling arguments?</li><li>- Is there a careful evaluation? Does the paper carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contributions? yes</li><li>- Does the paper offer a new form of evidence in support of or against a well known technique?</li><li>- If the paper describes an application, is there: a clear and compelling motivation for why the chosen approach is important? a careful description of the design and implementation of the system? a thorough evaluation of the system with respect to a clearly-stated set of functional and quality requirements? yes</li></ul> <p>QUALITY OF PRESENTATION (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Is the paper clearly written? yes</li><li>- Does the paper motivate the research? yes</li><li>- Are results clearly described and evaluated? yes</li><li>- Is the paper well organized? yes</li></ul>	Thanks, it's done
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	Thanks, it's done