

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3758
Title of the Manuscript:	Pregnancy outcomes of mothers with immune thrombocytopenia
Type of the Article	Book chapter

**General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This Book'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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>  
 Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/book-benefits-for-reviewers>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript has successfully x rayed the prevalence of ITP among pregnant women in the area of study. Also, the pregnancy outcomes were exposed. But, the sample size is not big enough to establish prevalence in the study population.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is not suitable enough. I suggest "Prevalence of ITP and pregnancy outcomes of women with ITP"	
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.	The background to the study is not sound enough. There should be little information on the causes of ITP during pregnancy	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	very sound and appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Though, this was a retrospective study, the manuscript scientifically robust and technically sound. It succeeded in using patient's data to establish an inference on the prevalence of ITP and the pregnancy outcomes of women who had ITP	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, putting into consideration the period the study covered	

[Review Form2](#)

Minor REVISION comments	The quality of English was good, but the author should improve on the use of space bar. Most of the sentences were joined together.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b><u>Reviewer's comment</u></b>	<b><u>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)</u></b>
<b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b>	<b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Eledo Benjamin</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>Madonna University, Nigeria</b>