



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_41001
Title of the Manuscript:	Uterine Didelphys pregnancy management
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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>Line 9 and 46: in my opinion, your objective has not been totally achieved, perhaps because of the design of your study (observational)? Would it not be more appropriate to write as objective "to describe the management of pregnant didelphys uterus women" ?</p> <p>Tables 3 and 4: Would it not be possible to do statistical tests to see if these results are significant or not?</p> <p>Line 129: "... need cervical cerclage more than women with normal anatomical uterus..." Not demonstrated during study (lack of statistics,...).</p>	<p>Agreed and done.</p> <p>I agree but we did not compare normal population in the study and in turn, it is impossible to compare their statistics here.</p> <p>Agreed and removed.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Table 3 and 4: I think that the item "lost as abortion" should be removed of the table 3 and appear only in the table 4 as you did.</p> <p>The whole discussion could be strengthened by statistics data of other studies when comparing.</p>	<p>Agreed and done.</p> <p>I agree but we did not compare normal population in the study and in turn, it is impossible to compare their statistics here.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>A Cohort study with control; and solid statistical studies would have been more interesting to establish the best management of pregnant didelphys uterus women</p>	<p>I agree but we did not compare normal population in the study and in turn, it is impossible to compare their statistics here. Hopefully statistics can be incorporated in future studies.</p>