



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_50333
Title of the Manuscript:	The Significance of 'Non-Significant' Meconium Stained Amniotic Fluid (MSAF): Colour versus Contents
Type of the Article	Commentary

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>Referencing and Citation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please read the 'authors guidelines' on the web page for the journal's protocol for writing references and citing them in the text in the square brackets [] <p>Placement of Figures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please place the figures at appropriate places in the text and not at the end of the text <p>Addressing Scientific Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a large part of discussion concerns meconium staining and development of chorioamnionitis it would be better to pretext this discussion on the premise of the reasons for development of chorioamnionitis due to meconium passage in the light of recent evidence and the prevalence of the same - Inactivation of neutrophil function – Please mention the time between exposure to meconium and the neutrophil inactivation and the first establishment of clinical infection <p>Coherence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At certain places chorioamnionitis, oxytocin use, meconium passage and gasping have been mentioned without clear distinction between them and also without a clear association between them (Line 124 – 133) <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mostly a repetition of abstract and the previous paragraph 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 11 – Clinicians - Line 20 – from a from a (from the) - Line 90 – please restructure the sentence to make grammatical sense - Line 116 - 117 - please restructure the sentence to make grammatical sense 	
Optional/General comments	The authors could have presented the rationale of the contrary argument which suggests that insignificant meconium staining is not an alarming feature, then contrasted it with the cons of the same in light of available evidence	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Ismail Khan
Department, University & Country	ESIC Medical College, India