



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_44542
Title of the Manuscript:	A Cross-Sectional Study on the Factors Leading to Unintended Pregnancy in Women Attending Selected Health Facilities in Kumasi, Ghana
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	Results: - Results starts directly from table 1 which should actually not happen and table 1 should be preceded with a small matter - Reference to tables in not given in the text, at the beginning of description of results from table 1 mention just once - Response rates need not be mentioned for each characteristic - Table 4 is very unclear, kindly make it understandable	Small matter has been added before the results begin. References issues has been corrected. Response rates have been removed. Table 4 has been removed. A new table 4 has been stated.
Minor REVISION comments	Title: A Cross-Sectional Study on the Factors Leading to Unintended Pregnancy in Women Attending Selected Health Facilities in Kumasi, Ghana - attending selected health facilities – not required - Study of the factors Abstract: 1) Background - Avoid mentioning statistical values from previous literature in the abstract 2) Methods - 5% significance ?? Introduction: - Line 47 – grammatical mistake Methods: - Line 58 to 64 – not required - Line 65 – please avoid the word contamination (rather the word bias could be used) - Line 79 – desired numbers were obtained (please mention if the sample size was calculated by using prevalence from existing studies) - Line 79 – 84 – the process can be explained in a short and sweet way - Line 85 – cleaned ? Results: - Education – Please mention what is the educational level which you have considered as basic ? There is a different description in abstract where the authors have mentioned high school, is it the same level or a different cut off, please be consistent with tis point. - Line 102 / 103: instead of using income earners and non income earners, the authors could have used the word, employed and unemployed - Line 105 – being (been) - Line 103, 107 – The authors need not mention (see table 1) - Line 112 – 115 – Please depict the same in table 1 - Table 2 – the stratification of income is mentioned under the description of table 1 but is depicted in table 2 - Line 118 – as seen in table 2 is not required - Line 118 to 121 and lines 122 to 125 appear to be describing the same characteristic, kindly give some clarity at this point - Line 129 to 131: mean and standard deviation is written as a single value and is not separated by a bracket)	I agree with the reviewer. The title has therefore been reviewed. The statistics in the abstract has been removed. The grammatical mistake has been corrected. Line 58 to 64 have been removed. Line 65 has been corrected. Line 79 has been corrected Lines 79 – 84 have been explained. Line 85 is removed. Education level has been rearranged well. Line 102 and 103 have been made employed and unemployed. Line 105 has been corrected Lines 103 and 107 have been removed. Lines 112-115 have been moved to Table 1 The stratification of income has been moved to Table 1 Line 118 in table 2 has been removed. Lines 118 -121 and 122 – 125 have been clarified Lines 129 t0 131 means and standard deviation have been corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Discussion - Line 158 – grammatical mistake - Conclusion can be made a little longer	Line 158 grammatical mistake has been corrected. We think the discussion and conclusion is okay. We have added something small to it.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Slight changes in writing style to meet the requirement of the journal and the scientific literature writing methods.	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

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>	