



## GPH Review Form

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Medicine and Medical Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJRMMS_1607
Title of the Manuscript:	MIDWIVES INTERVENTIONS TO MOTHERS WITH PRENATAL LOSS OR NEONATAL DEATH OCCURRING IN NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY TEACHING HOSPITAL NNEWI
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://globalpresshub.com/index.php/AJRMMS/editorial-policy> )



# GLOBAL PRESS HUB

## GPH Review Form

## 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)
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b></p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b></p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Yes, it is relevant</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b>, it is okay, there's need to revise on the grammar midwives' instead of midwives</p> <p><b>Not quite.</b> The third sentence seems to be bit deviating from the topic, may need revision. The methodology in the abstract is not fully captured e.g., how were the results presented, level of significance etc. The results are scantily reported. On the age range that states 5-40 yrs is not clear who it is addressing.</p> <p><b>Somehow</b>, but there is need to revise on the same. For instance, under sub topic Methodology, there is study population in which its content its more than study population, it telling us about questionnaires. <b>So create the relevant sub titles under methodology.</b></p> <p>Also on <b>results and discussion</b>, the first sentence is talking about data analysis; <b>So is the candidate analysing the data or giving us the results?</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes, they are recent.</b> Although the candidate may need to include others so as to avoid over repetition of the same author, <b>for example</b>; Fernández-Férez et al., (2021) has been mentioned 4 times</p> <p>On the response <b>Degree of psycho-social interventions the midwives offer to mothers with prenatal loss or neonatal death</b>, the reviewer feels that it would be weightier if it's the mothers who assessed that other than the midwives themselves. The recommendations are relevant</p>	<p>Okay</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Okay</p> <p>Revised</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Okay</p>

GPH Review Form

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Its fair. Need to revise and correct the obvious grammatical errors. Look also at the font size, style and also Alignment	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The candidate need to address the above before the publishing	

PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b>	<b>Author’s comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	