

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77629
Title of the Manuscript:	Assisted Vaginal Delivery - Preference of Vacuum or Forceps among Obstetricians
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Just inquisitive how many instrumental delivery each responded carried, Even they preferred one instrument, did they use other as well if situations demanded What happened to failed both instrumental deliveries and what was reason behind failure? Does obstetricians choice matter or situations matter? Fig 1-5 Make label inside pie chart readable Table 2, reason behind failure of ventouse Table 3, caput succedaneum is physiological in ventouse delivery	

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:	Ashma Rana
Department, University & Country	T. U. Teaching Hospital, Nepal