

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_130849
Title of the Manuscript:	MATERNAL AND FETAL DEMOGRAPHIC PREDICTORS OF FETAL MACROSOMIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This research topic is quite important as foetal macrosomia can lead to several morbidities. So finding out something which unknown in this field will definitely provide some evidence based solutions.	Thanks for the comments
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Suggestion: Methodology – 1. Why the study design is retrospective cross sectional study? A hospital based study can not be a cross sectional study, as it cannot give prevalence. So the prevalence of macrosomia that is mentioned in the manuscript is actually the “Proportion”. 2. Sample size need to be clearly mentioned, it is very confusing in the manuscript. 3. Sample size calculation need to be mentioned.	1. I disagree with the reviewer, hospital based studies could be cross-sectional, and uncountable numbers are being published daily. Secondly, prevalence in a cross-sectional study is in order, it is incidence that cannot be used here. 2. The sample size is clearly written in the abstract as 100 3. Sample size calculation is not ideal in a retrospective study involving retrieving information from patients' case notes.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Suggestion: Methodology – 1. Why the study design is retrospective cross sectional study? A hospital based study cannot be a cross sectional study, as it cannot give prevalence. So the prevalence of macrosomia that is mentioned in the manuscript is actually the “Proportion”. 2. Sample size need to be clearly mentioned, it is very confusing in the manuscript. 3. Sample size calculation need to be mentioned. Discussion – 1. 8 th Paragraph in discussion has spelling mistake; foetal is written as “fatal”.	1. Same as above The sample size is 100; however, the statement has been rephrased to make it clearer. 2. Same as above 3. Same as above Discussion - fatal has been correctly spelt as fetal.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient. But NOT as per Vancouver style, which is mostly followed by the journals	The journal editorial board clearly spelt out the guidelines for authors to follow for referencing, with an example. The directive was strictly complied with.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Methodology can be made more clear and understandable (few changes needed) The study design needs a proper explanation by the author.	The study design is a retrospective cross-sectional study

[Review Form 3](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	