## Review Form 1.6

| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | **International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_IJRRGY_88015** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Practices and Outcomes of Aboriginal Plant used by Parturients** |
| 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.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)* |
|---|---|---|
| **Compulsory** REVISION comments | There is no mention of obtaining ethical approval from the hospital. Was this obtained? If yes authors should include the ethics number.<br>No data seems to have been collected related to the socio-economic status of these women. The authors should list this as a limitation of the study<br>What do the authors mean by "abnormal uterine contractions"? Irregular? A definition of this loose term needs to be included<br>Is it possible to break down further the data in Table 8 to have equal categories e.g. <4 hours, 5-8, 9-12, 13-16 hours<br>In sections 3.15 and 3.16 the plants should include their species name since the common name is different around the world<br>In sections 3.15, 3.16 and in the Discussion "Sida cordifolia" is spelt incorrectly. Moreover, it should be in italics since it is a species name.<br>The Discussion fails to link the educational level, antinatal status and prevalence of use of herbal medicine with the probable low socio-economic status of such women which is probably one of the greatest risk factors for their complicated pregnancies.<br>The Conclusion states "The aim of this study is to contribute to the reduction of maternal-fetal morbidity and mortality among women using aboriginal plants during labour at Bengamisa General Referral Hospital during the period 28 July to 25 November 2018." but this is not true. The aim of the study was "to measure the hospital frequency of parturient use of aboriginal plants and record maternal-fetal outcomes in aboriginal plant users at the Bengamisa General Referral Hospital during the period 28 July to 25 November 2018" so the Conclusion should be changed. | |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | Minor corrections to the English syntax of some sentences | |
| **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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | |

## Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | **Byron Baron** |
| Department, University & Country | **University of Malta, Malta** |