



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_51147
Title of the Manuscript:	Pattern of Referral Cases to the Obstetrics Unit of the Rivers State University Teaching Hospital for Maternal Delivery
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>)

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>This study is a retrospective descriptive study of over 450 cases admitted to a tertiary centre for delivery and other obstetric emergencies. The abstract is complete.</p> <p>Introduction: It would be good to include the last paragraph relating to the health delivery system and when referrals are made in the beginning so as to appreciate the system adopted in the geographical region where the study is done. The aim of the study is clearly stated. The method has been spelt out . It would be good to state if this was a funded study and if permission for conduct of study and use of data was obtained from the Institute. The results are comprehensively handled and the tables are well displayed. The discussion shows comparison with other institute. As near 50% of the referrals were related to obstetric emergencies and equal proportion requiring caesarean section, it would be tidy to state how the results drawn from this study will reflect on antenatal policy. Is there a risk stratification system in antenatal care in the study area, would such a system assist in early referral of risk obstetrics patients. Include the limitations of the study and why only 460 case records were studied. References should adhere to Vancouver style throughout.</p>	<p>There is something on this in methodology, while describing the study area.</p> <p>There was no funding and permission was granted.</p> <p>See conclusion, amendment have been added.</p> <p>Limitations of study was stated at end of discussion and has been expanded to include why 460 cases. References followed instructions to authors.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper is well written in English and should be accepted for publication after minor revisions are made.</p>	<p>Thank you.</p>



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

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>