

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_85786
Title of the Manuscript:	Fetomaternal Outcome of Eclampsia in Shaheed Suhrawardy Medical College and Hospital, Dhaka, Bangladesh
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The rationale for the study should be rephrased in the introduction. It is not clear. Some inferences are being made to the outcome of the study</p> <p>Methods The description of the study site is inadequate, is the location rural or urban, bed capacity of hospital, what population is the hospital serving etc.The selection method is not clear. If it is a prospective study, what were the inclusion and exclusion criteria? What is the study definition of eclampsia? The technique of simple random sampling should be described. What statistical analysis was used analyse variables? From the tenses being used in the script, it is as if the study is now going to be carried out</p> <p>Results Needs restructuring. Some variables are repeated</p> <p>Discussion The key results is not discussed with study objectives principally because study objectives are not clear No limitation of the study was made</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The tenses, abbreviations such as "primi" and punctuations should be looked at too.	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> The manuscript does not indicate whether ethical clearance was sought before start of study	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paulina Clara Appiah
Department, University & Country	Ghana