

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58307

Title: *First-Trimester Neutrophil-to-Lymphocyte Ratio as an Early Predictor of Preeclampsia: A Hospital-Based Prospective Analytical Study*

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- The study addresses an important maternal health problem with high clinical relevance
- Prospective study design improves the reliability of findings
- Adequate sample size strengthens the analysis
- The methodology is clearly described and easy to follow
- Statistical analysis is appropriate and comprehensive
- The findings have practical value for low-resource healthcare settings
- The conclusions are supported by the study results

Weakness of the study:

- Single-center design limits the generalizability of findings
- External validation of the proposed cut-off value is needed
- Ethical approval and informed consent details should be stated more clearly
- Potential confounding factors require further discussion
- Long-term maternal and neonatal outcomes were not evaluated
- Minor grammatical and formatting corrections are needed
- Comparison with more recent multicenter studies would strengthen the discussion

Reviewers Comments:

This manuscript evaluates the usefulness of the first-trimester neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio as an early predictor of preeclampsia using a prospective analytical design. The topic is clinically important because early identification of women at risk can improve maternal and fetal outcomes. The methodology is appropriate, the sample size is satisfactory, and the statistical analysis is well performed. The reported diagnostic performance of NLR is impressive and may have practical implications, particularly in resource-limited settings. The manuscript is generally well written and logically organized. However, the authors should clearly report institutional ethical committee approval and informed consent in the methods section if not already stated. The limitations of the single-center design and the need for external validation should be emphasized further. Minor grammatical, typographical, and formatting corrections are also recommended to improve readability. Overall, this is a well-conducted study with good clinical relevance and is suitable for publication after minor revision.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to be an original prospective research study, and no obvious evidence of duplicate publication or copied material was identified during this review. No apparent plagiarism concerns were observed. However, the journal should perform a routine plagiarism similarity check before publication to confirm originality and ensure compliance with publication ethics.