

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_75807
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparativestudy to assess the placental weight in normal mothers and anaemic mothers during intranatal period in selected hospitals.
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	<p>Title</p> <p>1. There is need to leave space between comparative and study.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>2. Include the aim or purpose of the study</p> <p>3. The methods section is not informative. What exactly was done in this study? Did the authors examine, weigh, or just inspect the placenta? How was good condition determined?</p> <p>4. What was the sample size? How many were anaemic and how many were not? How was anemia defined? If 30 percent of anaemic mothers had average condition placenta, what was the condition of the 70% of the anaemic women?</p> <p>5. First line of the conclusion is not clear.</p> <p>6. The conclusion is not meaningful without the purpose of the study.</p> <p>7. The sentence that there is need for larger sample to find out the findings does not add anything to the body of knowledge. You need to make conclusion based on the purpose of the study and your findings.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>8. Add space between “and” and “translucent” in line 30 and between “surface” and “which” in line 31,</p> <p>9. Is ” likebattledore/marginal” in line 33 one word? Add spaces</p> <p>10. There is need for a citation between line 34 and line 39, otherwise it will be considered as plagiarism.</p> <p>11. The citation in line 40, should it be after the growth or before the word anemia?</p> <p>12. Add space between “anemia” and “in” in line 45</p> <p>13. Remove unnecessary spaces and add some spaces between words in lines 46-47</p> <p>14. The sentence in line 51-53 is not clear, and it does not reflect what is written on the website cited.</p> <p>15. Add space between the period and anemia in line 53.</p> <p>16. In lines 53-56, you can not mention the causes of anemia in pregnancy without mentioning hemodilution</p> <p>17. Check spaces between words line 59. There is need to revise the whole document to make sure words are spaced accordingly.</p> <p>18. The background does not give the context of why the authors decided to conduct this type of study. There is no justification for this study. Where is the gap in literature?</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>19. Sentence in line 62-64 needs revision, it does not read well. Also, you said this is a quantitative study why use purposive sampling? May be you needed to use convenience sampling</p> <p>20. In line 65, How was the questionnaire administered? Was it face to face?</p> <p>21. Line 65-68, just indicate informed consent was obtained. I don't know how this study would benefit the women.</p> <p>22. Line 65, what is designated area?</p> <p>23. Avoid pronouns in the paper e.g., “her” in line 67. After all it is not proper to say, “her questioned”, “she” would be grammatically right</p> <p>24. From line 62, these women were recruited while in labour. This poses an ethical issue. How did you ensure that their ethical wellbeing is not violated. How was consenting done. Because laboring women are vulnerable, and they might not have made an autonomous decision to join this study.</p> <p>25. Instead of saying graph, you can say figure</p> <p>26. Line 70, I think by the time you were collecting the placenta, the baby was born, so</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>there is no way you could do a fetal assessment. I think what was done here was new-born assessment or neonatal assessment. The fetus is when the baby is not yet born.</p> <p>27. Lines 71-77, there is need to describe the tool further. What type of tool was this, was this a checklist for placenta and new-born examination, what exactly were you looking for? Were the women at all interviewed, what type of questions and response options were these?</p> <p>28. Lines 76-77, how did you ensure that meaning was not changed when the tool was translated from English to Marathi? Was back translation done? Who did the translation, I mean what expertise does the translator have?</p> <p>29. Was this study approved by the institutional review board?</p> <p>30. Line 86, the first word needs spacing. I don't think "Anadequate" is one word.</p> <p>31. On sample size, you said a sample of 30 anemic and 30 normal was selected from a population of 60? It appears you took the whole population. How come you were able to have a balanced design 30 normal and 30 anemic from a population of 60? This sentence needs rephrasing. You might consider not to use the word population.</p> <p>32. How was sample size determined? What was the power? Or did you probably use central limit theorem? There is need for justification.</p> <p>33. What was the inclusion and exclusion criteria?</p> <p>34. How was anemia determined? Was hemoglobin level checked?</p> <p>35. What is AVBRH labor room? Abbreviations should be interpreted the first time they are introduced.</p> <p>36. What was the inclusion and exclusion criteria?</p> <p>37. Lines 92-96, rephrase the title of the table. Percentage wise is not correct. Also, the section is not only addressing primgravidas, chose a more encompassing word.</p> <p>38. If total sample was 60, the "n" should be in upper case.</p> <p>39. Lines 99-124, you don't have to repeat what is in the table, you can briefly comment on the table and refer your readers to the table.</p> <p>40. Table 2.1 how many kgs were considered poor weight. There is need to quantify poor, average etc. Also, is weight the only parameter for a healthy placenta?</p> <p>41. Line 131 don't repeat figures in words, 93% should be fine as long as it is not mentioned at the beginning of the sentence.</p> <p>42. Table 3.1 and 3.2 can be combined. The means in these tables are referring to what? Is it mean of normal mother, what about the normal or anemic mother? What is the meaning of the S after the p value? All abbreviations in the table should be interpreted.</p> <p>43. Again, in the results do not repeat what the figures or tables are showing. You need to find a way of describing these results without repeating them.</p> <p>44. What is the Y axis of figure 3.1 and 3.2, you need to label them.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>45. Lines 180-204, you are just repeating the results. In the discussion section you need to interpret the results and give explanations and/or implications of your findings and relate to what previous studies have found.</p> <p>46. Lines 205-242, how are these studies related to your study? Is there any consistency, do these study findings differ from your findings? How do they differ, or how are they related and what does this inform practice?</p> <p>47. You do not need to narrate the studies, select what is relevant and relate to your study.</p> <p>48. Lines 243-244, apart from nutrition, what is the standard care of pregnant women in the country? Do women receive iron supplements? Because we know it is not only nutrition but there is also hemodilution taking place due to physiological changes of pregnancy. Is there any need to change the practice guidelines?</p> <p>49. Line 246, add space between "that" and "placental"</p> <p>50. Your conclusion is not a conclusion. You are also just repeating the results. You need to indicate what the reader should take home after reading your paper.</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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> Yes, the study involved pregnant laboring women, it is not clear how the ethical principles were addressed. There is no indication that the study was approved by the Institutional Review Board.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Sadandaula Rose Muheriwa Matemba</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Rochester, USA</i>