

Review of: "Comparative Study between Using Only Vaginal Misoprostol and Using Vaginal Misoprostol and Estradiol Cream for Induction of Labour: Randomized controlled trial"

Lindsey Baertlein¹

¹ University of Arkansas - Little Rock

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Typo in the very first sentence. Induction of labor is IOL, not IOA.

The typos and grammatical errors in the study could be improved with a simple spellcheck/grammar check. The writing in the article, although commendable effort, does not align with scholarly writing.

Increase the sample size in future replication studies. The study is highly underpowered.

As a labor and delivery nurse of 14 years, it is very confusing to me to compare the use of misoprostol with misoprostol and estradiol as an experimental group. Everything we know about estradiol is not discussed in the article. The uses for estradiol are not discussed. It is not an induction of labor agent and works against the high progesterone levels needed to maintain a pregnancy, but a source from 10 years ago was used (outdated source). Consider utilizing sources published in the past five years.

The Allocation Concealment Mechanism should be discussed in the participant/sample section. It impacts the flow of reading when placed at the end of the participant section.

The strengths of the study include discussion on comparisons to previous studies and how this study differed.

Use Grammar check. There are numerous typo errors, such as Induction of Labor being abbreviated to IOA, fragmented sentences, and misuse of semicolon and commas.