



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_52841
Title of the Manuscript:	Pattern and Socio-Demographic Determinants of Gestational Age at Antenatal Booking at the Rivers State University Teaching Hospital, Nigeria: a two-year review.
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>This research paper 'Pattern and Socio-Demographic Determinants of Gestational Age at Antenatal Booking at the Rivers State University Teaching Hospital, Nigeria: a two-year review'</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title can be revised- without the operational definitions it is difficult to know what the author meant by "Pattern" and "Determinants" see attached email In the Introduction: 1. What is the picture of the problem under study from a global perspective? 2. The first (1) and second (2) paragraph in the introduction were more oriented to antenatal care and not early gestational age booking 3. In the introduction - Paragraph five (5) 'Previous studies' is the author referring to the studies in paragraph four (4) on the fifth line or other studies? It is better to indicate how many studies found the "various reasons" being referred to by the author. 4. In the introduction - Same paragraph (5) the word "Only a handful" need to be rephrased, the author has not exhausted or looked at a wider range of studies to come to that conclusion (this was speculations or assumptions) 5. In the introduction - Paragraph four (4) and five (5) need to be integrated. The presentation of data was more of results and discussion style. 6. In the introduction - Literature reviewed was > 75 % from one region of the continent 7. In the methodology – First Trimester is from (1-12 weeks) second (13-26 weeks) and third (27-40 weeks) 13 weeks means one has entered second trimester 8. In the methodology- gestational age as confirmed by sure date of last menses. This was a review of records where the mothers present to surely confirm the dates? Who probed mothers for the dates how possible is it? 9. In the Methodology – ALL does this mean all records were complete; no mention of checking for completeness has been stated. No records were rejected on the basis of incompleteness.it seems record keeping is excellent in this facility. (consider human error being a possibility) 10. In the Methodology – the sequence of events need to be re-arranged to enhance proper flow of methodological events or rather need for sub-headings 11. In the Methodology – Was any other person trained involved in the reviewing of records? This was not mentioned. Was the researcher alone in the review of 3560 records? 12. In the Methodology – the phrase "round the clock" to be revisited such phrases are avoided in literature publication 13. In the Methodology – Low and high risk pregnancies. Any pregnancy is a risk one cannot predict the outcome. Remove low risk 14. In the results – remove "during the study period" instead the phrase "the period under review" would be more appropriate 15. In the results – To separate the two years under review will give a clear pattern (Picture) since the author did not give the operational definitions for meaning of pattern in the study 16. In the discussion – paragraph four - Give the rationale, opinion or your impression for such findings. 17. In the discussion last paragraph add services at the end of the sentence to 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>read institutional services</p> <p>18. In the discussion – last paragraph, it would be better to put the sub heading – Limitations of the study</p> <p>19. In the conclusion – last sentence – add “for” after advocated</p> <p>20. Referencing: 3/19(15%) from developed countries; 52.6% from Nigeria and 84% (16) from SSA. The authors’ literature review may be sighted or considered for biasness as most references came from one region and only 15% came from outside the region.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paragraph three in the introduction, to rephrase \the words “NO SUCH” it sounds to be author’s speculation, no quoting or referencing is made to indicate the authenticity of the statement. 2. The study is for Nigeria therefore generalization to (SSA) may come after the study is authenticated. Or should read in some SSA countries. 3. In the results – table 2 - change the title to “Pattern of socio-demographic characteristics for the antenatal clinic attendees” 4. In the result – table two – insert the word “frequency” under narrative of figures 1,2 and 3. 5. In the result – under narrative for table 1,2 and 3 remove it 6. In the result – Figure 1,2 and 3 the figures should be reflected in percentages or a figure and percentage in brackets and be printed in colour 7. In the result- narrative part: table 3 insert the word “below” after table 3shows 8. In the result – narrative section, tabulate or itemise the socio-demographics age, educational qualifications and parity. 9. In the Discussion - second line, insert the word ‘schedule’ after recommended time 10. In the Discussion – the author is not giving his/her point of view over the results obtained from the study in comparison to other study results. In short the author has not interpreted his/her results instead just stating. More importantly interpretation of the results by the researcher from which a conclusion is drawn is paramount (what could be the reasons for your findings visa view other studies?) 11. The discussion is more interesting If the author gives details of other researchers findings in comparison to his or hers than just listing studies – see paragraph two (2) and (3) of the discussion lines 1 to 3 respectively. 12. In the discussion – second last sentence of paragraph (3) insert the word “may” in the sentence “This multiple booking also.....” 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. The wording in the title – The fact that operational definitions are not included in the study it is difficult to know what ‘Pattern’ and ‘Determinants’ may mean in this study. 14. The author shows some laziness in the way he/she states the facts or findings of other studies – see paragraph four of the discussion phrases such as “and others sited above” author need to mention and quote the study in question 15. There is need to put sub-headings to guide the reader who may not be a medical personnel of researcher who are able to deduce what is the content is about in each paragraph. E.g. the last paragraph in the conclusion is recommendations. 	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chansa Regina
Department, University & Country	Lukupa College of Nursing, Zambia