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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses critical gaps in the understanding, diagnosis, and management of intrauterine infection and inflammation. By reviewing and analyzing the challenges associated with diagnostic criteria, labor management, and neonatal outcomes, it provides valuable insights that can guide clinical practices and reduce maternal-fetal morbidity. The emphasis on contemporary issues such as antibiotic resistance, the impact of epidural analgesia, and the use of neonatal early-onset sepsis calculators makes this review highly relevant to improving evidence-based approaches. Furthermore, it identifies areas for future research, fostering advancements in maternal-fetal medicine. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title of the article, **"Navigating the Challenges of Intrauterine Infection and Inflammation: A Comprehensive Review of Diagnosis and Management of Triple I"**, is generally clear and informative. It conveys the focus of the review while highlighting the dual challenges of diagnosis and management. However, it could be slightly refined for conciseness and impact. Here’s a suggestion:**"Intrauterine Infection and Inflammation (Triple I): Challenges in Diagnosis and Management"**This alternative retains the key elements of the original title while being more concise. It maintains the focus on the challenges and scope of the review while clearly identifying the topic as Triple I. |  |
| 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 abstract provides a good overview of the topic but can be improved for clarity, coherence, and comprehensiveness. Below are my detailed suggestions for improvement:Clarify Key Points: define Triple I more clearly at the outset (e.g., briefly explain "intrauterine infection and/or inflammation").Specify examples of detrimental pregnancy outcomes for better reader engagement.Add Context: provide a brief mention of how common or significant Triple I is (e.g., prevalence or global burden).Include a sentence about the methods used in this narrative review (e.g., scope of literature reviewed).Avoid Redundancy: the phrase “In the literature, many studies and reviews have discussed TRIPLE I in detail” can be streamlined or removed as the focus is on the unresolved issues.Conclusion and Impact: end with a stronger statement on how the insights provided in the review will advance clinical practice or research. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, offering a detailed review of the diagnostic and management challenges of Triple I (Intrauterine Infection, Inflammation, or Both). The introduction provides a clear background on the condition, its prevalence, and its clinical significance. It highlights the complications of delayed diagnosis and overdiagnosis effectively, setting the stage for the issues discussed in the review.The methods section outlines the narrative review approach, specifying the inclusion of 51 quality studies conducted between 2000 and 2022. This adds credibility to the findings, though more detail on the criteria for "quality studies" could enhance transparency.The results section is comprehensive, addressing diagnostic challenges, the impact of epidural analgesia, CTG interpretation dilemmas, and issues like labor induction, multi-drug-resistant organisms, and neonatal sepsis management. The use of studies and meta-analyses to support conclusions strengthens the manuscript's scientific foundation.The manuscript effectively summarizes current knowledge, highlights gaps, and proposes areas for future research. However, clarifying any potential limitations of the review would further solidify its reliability. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | The references provided are extensive and cover a wide range of topics related to chorioamnionitis, labor management, neonatal outcomes, and sepsis. The references include studies on chorioamnionitis, neonatal sepsis, maternal outcomes, and various labor management interventions, indicating comprehensive coverage of the subject. Several references include high-quality evidence from systematic reviews and meta-analyses, which strengthen the manuscript.Many references are from the last five years, ensuring the inclusion of up-to-date research.Some references (e.g., Gibbs, 1977; Hollander, 1986) are over 30 years old. While they may provide foundational knowledge, replacing or supplementing these with more recent studies would strengthen the reference list.Evaluate the relevance of older references and consider replacing them with more recent studies where possible. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas that require improvement for clarity and precision. The text demonstrates a good command of technical terminology and a logical flow of ideas, which are appropriate for an academic audience. However, minor grammatical errors, repetitive phrasing, and overly lengthy sentences can impede readability and understanding. For instance, phrases such as "the diagnosis in these cases is usually delayed as cultures results may take 48 hours or more" can be streamlined for better conciseness. Moreover, consistent formatting of references and adherence to a specific citation style will enhance the manuscript’s professionalism. Addressing these issues will improve its scholarly quality. |  |
| Optional/General comments | Comments for the Introduction & Background SectionThe section effectively outlines the problem of Triple I (intrauterine infection, inflammation, or both) and its clinical significance. However, some parts could benefit from more concise wording to enhance clarity and readability. The prevalence statistics and implications of Triple I are well presented, but the flow could be improved to prioritize the most critical points.The references used to support the discussion are appropriate and relevant. However, the integration of studies could be better balanced; for example, consider summarizing findings from multiple sources to avoid redundancy. Ensure all references are recent and adequately cited, as this lends credibility to the narrative.Clarity of Objectives:The objective is stated but could be more explicitly linked to the challenges outlined in the introduction. Consider framing it as addressing the diagnostic and management gaps identified in the background.Structure and Flow:The issues with diagnosis and management are listed clearly. However, the transition from the background to the specific challenges could be smoother. The section about the need for future research is well-placed but could be more compelling if specific gaps in existing knowledge are highlighted.Language and Style:The tone is formal and scientific, which is appropriate for the target audience. However, some sentences are lengthy and could be split for better readability. Avoid repetition of phrases like "TRIPLE I is known to cause detrimental pregnancy outcomes" to maintain engagement.Suggestions for Improvement:Consider adding a brief summary paragraph at the end of the introduction that ties together the challenges and objectives. Highlight the potential implications of addressing these challenges, both for clinical practice and patient outcomes, to emphasize the significance of the review. Simplify the language in some areas to ensure that key messages are clear and impactful.  |  |
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|  | **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?**  | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |
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