



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_19784
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating the Anxiety Status of Pregnant Women in the Third Trimester of Pregnancy and Fear of Childbirth and Related Factors
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>)



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	The abstract needs many reformulation. Please, rewrite the Introduction as in the present form there are many overlapping information and the sentences do not follow a clear order. Give a clear aim to this study (e.g. there was no information about anxiety among pregnant women in our country – or area; the literature is not unified about the changes in anxiety during the course of pregnancy) The method section needs some English correction. It would be nice to conduct a more sophisticated statistical analysis (e.g. principal component analysis) to identify the most important components of the dataseries. l145 and Table 1. It is not clear, at which pregnancy age were these parameters measured. l154-158: the data belonging to these paragraph is not presented. Please clarify, which data are presented in Table 2. (is this the sum or average of the three evaluation or just the last one?) l177-178: try to give some explanation for the conflicting results. The given explanation was not clear. l193-194: the given explanation actually is in contrast to the finding. As far as I understood the present results show lower anxiety in women with previous history of abortion than without in contrast to the cited data l204-205. How can you explain this? Please give in the conclusion the main findings (which factors were the most important determinant of the	Was corrected Was corrected Was corrected Was corrected Was corrected Was corrected Was corrected In the present study: improves mental health(decrease of anxiety) with higher education We thought that they might have more anxiety but it was contrary to the results Was corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	anxiety level). It would be nice to have a conclusion regarding overt and covert anxiety (does it make sense to distinguish between them, as the presented results were not significantly different between them. Perhaps examining only one could also lead to a shorter questionnaire). Give to the limitation of the study that only city inhabitants were studied and the examined women were in a quite narrow age-group, thus the effect of older age could not be determined.	Was corrected Was corrected
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<u>Abstract:</u> opportunity is not the best word here. Delete “it” and the part after “which” from the first sentence. Some spaces are missing. Analysis of variance is ANOVA. Correct 0/05 to 0.05 (and similar numbers throughout the paper). “in the second round was more than the first and second round” it make no sence. What was teh round exactly? The first or second examination? When they were conducted? Was teh correlation positive or negative? <u>Introduction:</u> „adaptable response” adaptive response l44. Delete “it” l49. “the prevalence of anxiety” among pregnant woman? When was it measured (third trimester?) How big was teh examined population? l56 „hard trimester”? l92 „one twin pregnancy” ? l121 „the scoreis6 or more representative of childbirth” ? l131 „were controlled during by deleting” ? do you mean that patientes with these event were excluded (however, it was partly stated previously)? l131 Give a new paragraph to statistical analysis l147-148 covetr and overt are missing fro the sentences. l159. It should be stated that data from the third trimester is analysed here. l209 Perhaps the other way round (factor determining anxiety was age) Age is the first parameter in Table 2, but discussed only later (however, it is one of the most robust finding) l248 Delete in.	Was corrected Was corrected Was corrected Was corrected Was corrected Was corrected Was corrected Was corrected Was corrected Was corrected Several studies have examined the psychiatric disorders including anxiety during pregnancy and have reported different prevalence of anxiety. For example, the prevalence of anxiety in ...
---------------------------------------	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This study is a longitudinal follow up of the anxiety states of pregnant women in Quchan city, Iran. The question is important and because of possible geographical variability it is worth to conduct study on different palces of teh world even with the same design. The study design seems to be OK, however, the presentation and interpretation of the data are a bit confusing. e.g. the authors measured different parameters at three timepoints (however, all of them were in the third trimester), but only single dataserie was presented (despite the desribed time effect). The English usage also need improvement and there are a lot of typographical error, too.	Was corrected Was corrected Was corrected
---	--	--