



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_37743
Title of the Manuscript:	Contraceptive Practices Among Married Women of Reproductive Age Group in Ogbomoso Metropolis, Nigeria
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Abstract Background: delete second sentence (lines 9-11). Results: Include p-values for the statistically significant parameters. Conclusion: Too long, reduce two sentences to contain the most important message you want to pass across to the readers. 2. Body of the article a. Line 56: change 'has' to 'have' b. Line 61: change 'bt' to 'by' c. Why did you obtain ethical clearance from UITH, Ilorin when Ogbomoso is in Oyo state and has two teaching hospitals and one university? You need not include the answer to this query in the article but MUST be clarified here. d. Line 81: change 'Respondents' to 'respondents' e. Line 85: change '64.6' to '64.6%' f. Lines 85 & 86: how could IUCD 64.6% be commonest contraceptive when pill was quoted as '66.2%'? g. Line 100: change 'are' to 'were' h. Line 102: close space after 'side effect' i. Line 102: not clear, reframe the sentence j. Line 108: change 'Health' to 'health' k. Tables: inconsistencies especially with tables 6 & 7 compared to others. Also, 7 tables are too many-merge tables 1 with 2 and tables 5 to 6. Table 7: what does the statistical significance really imply i.e. did contraception uptake increase with increasing level of education etc.? l. Discussion: start with an opening paragraph to summarise important findings from your study which you wish to discuss- be careful not to repeat your results section. Search and include articles from Kwara, Oyo and Osun states especially who did similar work. There is paucity of local and regional references. It is odd to compare knowledge about contraception to Pakistani studies without relating to local and regional studies. Lines 41 & 42: not in your result section Lines 145 & 147: not reflected in your results Lines 155 & 156: not in your results Lines 167-169: not clear, reframe the sentence m. Conclusion: not scientific- there was a very high awareness, why are you still recommending increasing awareness? I suppose that you will consider the need to address the hindrances to uptake highlighted in your result as a means of increasing uptake? 3. References Kindly take a close look at reference numbers 4,5,7,8,9,10,12,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,24,26. The gross errors ARE VERY CLEAR.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abiodun Adeniran
Department, University & Country	Obstetrics & Gynaecology, University Of Ilorin, Nigeria