



## 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	Descriptive – Cross sectional

## 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> )



## [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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	  1. Yes, I think this manuscript has a topic that is still rarely researched and interesting to be developed more deeply.  2. 2. I think the title would be better if it started with "psycho-social and physical interventions by midwives for mothers who experience miscarriage or neonatal death"  3. Yes, I think the abstract of the article is comprehensive.  4. Some parts of the manuscript are less structured based on IMRAD. That includes results and discussion, but there is another discussion section. There are still sections such as objectives and hypotheses and study population.  5. Yes, I think this manuscript is scientifically correct and also interesting.  6. All references are proper, recent, and sufficient.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



# GLOBAL PRESS HUB

[GPH Review Form](#)

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Fransisca Retno Asih
Department, University & Country	Indonesia