



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_48146
Title of the Manuscript:	Maternal and Perinatal Outcomes in Childbirths with Meconium Stained Amniotic Fluid in a Low-resourceSetting: A Prospective Cohort Study
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:

(<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The theme dealt here is interesting. I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In abstract, you had better state the following meaning: "Risk ratio (RR) or Odds ratio (OR) of MSAF on the various perinatal outcomes were shown (calculated) by multivariate logistic regression (with MSAF (-) being a referent)". You need not use the expression per se.</li> <li>2. In tables, all abbreviations should be spelled out as footnotes irrespective whether you already defined the abbreviations in the text. This is because Tables should be self-explanatory and this is a fundamental rule of paper writing.</li> <li>3. In my opinion, this study did not provide "new" information as to MSAF. This is reconfirmation of the preexisting data. Thus, you had better definitely state the following meaning. "This study did not provide any novel findings regarding MSAF and confirmed the preexisting data already published in studies targeting various populations. However, we believe that every area should have their own data regarding the effect of MSAF on perinatal outcome since MSAF is a very frequent phenomenon and represents both physiological and pathological conditions. The present study provided important data in medical policy making in this corresponding area. Also, this data may be, at least partly, generalizable in many developing countries." To tell you straightforwardly, original paper should have something "novel" and based on this "fundamentals" this paper does not stand. However, above statement may increase the chance of acceptance. I hope that next time you may provide "novel" findings. I hope that you might take my advice positively.</li> <li>4. English should be revised.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

**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:	<i><b>Shigeki Matsubara</b></i>
Department, University & Country	<i><b>Jichi Medical University, Japan</b></i>