

Paper: “Evaluation of Preeclampsia Risk in Gestational Weight Gain”

Submitted: 08 November 2022

Accepted: 08 December 2022

Published: 31 December 2022

Corresponding Author: Erjona Abazaj

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p389](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p389)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Merita Rumano

Reviewer 2: Ruth Magdalena Gallegos Torres

Reviewer 3: Elena Hunt

Merita Rumano

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-12-20 08:54 PM

Recommendation: Accept Submission

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*** Title is clear and adequate**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*** The abstract is correct**

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

When the author discusses about neonatal outcomes, weight and macrosomia, kg should be corrected to gram.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*** Correct**

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*** Correct**

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*** Correct**

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*** Correct**

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Ruth Magdalena Gallegos Torres

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-12-20 08:54 PM

Recommendation: Accept Submission

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

* Yes, it is

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

* authors need to adjust the number of words. Some other observations are in the document.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

just few

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

* yes, it is

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

* just few, you can see it on the document.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

* yes, it is

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*** yes, it is**

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. ***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Dr. Elena Hunt	
University/Country: Laurentian University, Canada	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Evaluation of preeclampsia risk in gestational weight gain	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 16138-Article Text-46870-1-4-20221122	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result
-----------	---------------

	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Please, see annotated text.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4,5
<i>Please, see annotated text.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i><u>Please see APA formatting.</u></i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Clearly streamlined, easy to read and understand article. Well-designed study and well structured text.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: