



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_36736
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF BACTERIAL VAGINOSIS AMONG PATIENTS WITH VULVOVAGINITIS IN A TERTIARY HOSPITAL IN PORT HARCOURT, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the 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	Line 5: The comma (,) after "Bacterial vaginosis (BV)" should be removed. Lines 6-7: "Majority of the patients have vaginal discharge and pruritus while others have dysmenorrhoea." This sentence should not appear in the background. A brief introduction is expected here and not your result. Line 7: "Bacterial" is expected to start with a small letter here, and this correction should be effected in other places where it has been used within a sentence, unless it is starting a sentence. Line 11-12: "To also relate the prevalence to age group and presenting complaints." This sentence is not an aim; it is a specific objective that has been captured in the previous sentence. So, it should be removed. Line 13: "200" should first be written in words when starting a sentence. Numbers don't normally start sentences in scientific reports. This also applicable to line 17. "Vulvovaginitis should start with a lower case as it is within a sentence. Please, this correction should be effected where necessary throughout the write-up e.g. line 20. Line 20: What is novel about this conclusion? Please, refer to line 27 and 86-87 where you already reported same in existing literatures by McCormack (2015), and Keen and Aldous (2015), respectively. Then what is really new? Line 34: Mild should not start with capital case within the sentence. Line 45: "percent" not per cent. Lines 50-54: These reports are better suited for discussion. They should be moved to discussion section. Line 55: The conjunction "but" should be used in place of "however". Line 58-59: This needs recast. "This study aims at knowing the true burden of this disease condition in our environment with the purpose of creating more awareness and the use of appropriate therapy." Consider "This study aims at establishing the status of disease condition in Port Harcourt with the purpose of creating more awareness and which should aid appropriate therapy." Line 70: "done about it" should be better replaced by "carried out". Line 97: "vaginal microbiota are" not "is"; <i>Lactobacillus</i> species not specie. Please, note that species is singular, and it is also the plural. Line 102: involved not involve. Line 107: <i>Gardnerella vaginalis</i>. A period (.) was erroneously introduced; it should be removed. Line 109: Amsel et al.(reference number should be indicated as well). Line 114: Let there be consistency in the use of Gram, as used in line 112. Line 115: spp should not be italicized. Please, this correction should be effected in order places within the write-up. Line 119: please, what is the title of this table. Line 130: Metronidazole should start with a small letter and all names of antibiotics not starting a sentence should also commence with a small letter in this write up. Line 139: "Medical Microbiology Laboratory". Which one and where? Line 169: This line needs recast. Line 170: was viewed not was view Lines 173-180: Please, your findings are your results. This should be appropriately presented under result section as a table or otherwise. Line 197: Table 1 not Table one. The table was not well-titled. Consider "Percentage prevalence of bacterial vaginosis in relation to different age-group." Line 200: Table 2: "Educational status of participants in relation to age-group". Line 202: Please, write appropriately. The title also should be completely written. A table is expected to be self-explanatory. "Genitourinary signs and symptoms" of what ? Line 207: Agarwa et al (reference number should be indicated), and this correction should be applied where necessary as there are numerous of this in several lines. Lines 208-210: "This further buttressed the assertion that Bacterial vaginosis is the most common cause of Vulvovaginal symptoms among women of childbearing age, accounting for 40 to 50 percent of cases." This statement confirmed a "lack of novelty" in this work. The statement should be better removed. Line 220: "This was similar to the finding of (<i>Muvunyi and Hernandez</i>) in Rwanda²⁰ <i>Muvunyi and Hernandez</i> should neither be in bracket nor italicized. This was similar to the finding of <i>Muvunyi and Hernandez</i>²⁰ in Rwanda. This is also applicable to Line 221. Line 228: This finding was in similarity with what was reported in a similar study in southern Rwanda. This statement need recast; there is a form of tautology.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 234: where not were. Line 243: Please, most common should be used in place of commoner. LIST OF REFERENCES DID NOT COMPLY WITH A PARTICULAR FORMAT. There were inconsistencies in style (format) of reference and justification. This needs thorough typesetting and formatting.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Author(s) should look into the use of punctuation marks and right choice of words. All corrections pointed out should be effected and applied to other similar ones within the write-up	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Olorunjuwon Omolaja Bello</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Biological Sciences, College of Natural and Applied Sciences, Wesley University Ondo, Ondo State, Nigeria</i>