



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>)



SDI 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>The research topic which has been investigated is good and the sample size which has been recruited is also a significant number as uterine didelphys is a rare mullerian anomaly. But the manuscript needs to be rewritten as the written manuscript does not convey the results of such a big study properly. This could be due to the fact that the authors may not be using English as their first language. They should seek help in this aspect as many things are not clear to the readers. Some of the examples have been quoted here:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kindly justify the objective of the study in the introduction in the abstract as well as the main text. The authors have mentioned the aim of the study was to study "the best method to manage"...when all they have done is studied the outcome of pregnant ladies with uterine didelphys. 2. From where the ethical clearance was taken .i.e the review committee name has to be mentioned. Since it is a multicentric trial ethical clearance has to be taken from the ethical board of all institutes, national health research council..whatever body is there. It has to be mentioned in methods and methodology. 3. Conclusions need to be drawn from the specific findings of the present study..generalised statements should be avoided 4. Most of the findings depicted in tables have been repeated in text. It should be avoided 5. Referencing is incomplete and needs to be updated. Kindly add the doi and PMID of the articles if available. <p>Ethical clearance details have not been mentioned. From which body?? What kind of consent from patients?? Written/verbal???</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Kindly review the pdf attached where some corrections have been made and comments have been highlighted	
Optional/General comments	The topic chosen is good , good number of sample size but manuscript drafting needs to improved. A re- written vesion can be considered for publication.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manisha Chhetry
Department, University & Country	Obstetrics and Gynecology, Kathmandu University, Nepal