



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_42810</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PLACENTAL LOCATION, BLOOD GROUP, GENOTYPE AND PARITY IN PORT HARCOURT WOMEN</b>
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>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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 important. I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If you wish to state "where this study was performed", state "country". Nobody/few knows your institute and its description is meaningless.</li> <li>2. Abstract: methods should be written as "what you actually did" manner. You only wrote statistics, which is "ordinary" method. No need to write it. Write what you did.</li> <li>3. Results: No need to write all data in this detailed manner. This markedly weakens "what you want to say here" (the most important findings).</li> <li>4. Conclusion last: Nobody expects that some such factors "predict" placental location. One can only say presence or absence of relationship between placental location and these factors. "Predict" sounds very peculiar.</li> <li>5. Introduction. Delete all up to line 40. You only studied on the placental location. You need not write "placental function" in this textbook like manner.</li> <li>6. Line 51: Cite references</li> <li>7. PL and placental location are both used.</li> <li>8. Line 57-9: parenthesis is wrong.</li> <li>9. Line 63 "examined": the study finished and thus use past sentence.</li> <li>10. Delete all figures. To demonstrate such simple issues, tables are not what so ever needed. It only occupies the space. The shorter, the better.</li> <li>11. At last, what is your conclusion? What did you newly found here? You mentioned several factors that may influence the placental location in the literature but you did not check them here. Delete all these textbook like description.</li> <li>12. . The data is fundamentally "negative". Even though negative data sometimes is useful but do state SIGNIFICANCE of this study.</li> <li>13. How do you apply the present findings to daily practice?</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

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