

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_84635
Title of the Manuscript:	Cerebroplacental Doppler Ratio and Cerebrouterine Doppler Ratio in Predicting Neonatal Outcome in Preeclamptic Pregnant Women
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Please spell-check your document, cross-reference literature cited in the text against the bibliography, and ensure that every entry in the bibliography is accurate and has the correct format	
Minor REVISION comments	A new paragraph should be added in the introduction that show te Doppler details and many previous studies are included this part In figure 2 ROC curve showed be separated not a and b to be better clear to show the findings The conclusion part in abstract is unclear .;please clarify The important details in materials and methods are missed in the abstract Try to select another key words that not present in the title Very long paragraphs in introduction, please summarize it or divide it into short one Check reference 4 and 5 Recommendation should be carefully written and modified Figure 2 :I am not understand this please clarify The conclusion need to be written again to become more simple and clear - methodology. -One important question is about the definition of experimental groups	
Optional/General comments	Originality of the study is good, but there are numerous grammar and language issues, which need to be addressed. Unfortunately, due to shortcomings in the language of the manuscript, I could not fully assess its quality. -I suggest that the authors carefully revise the manuscript and rewrite it. A few suggestions are given in an attempt to help prepare this revision.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elshymaa A. Abdelnaby
Department, University & Country	Cairo Unversity, Egypt