



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	Overall: there are many grammatical problems with this paper. It needs to be edited by a native English speaker. Both the introduction and the methods section would benefit from being broken up some. The Methods section, for example, is one long paragraph. This makes it very hard to read. Creating sub-headings might help (setting/procedures, measures, analysis perhaps). Abstract: Most of the sentences in the abstract are not complete sentences. Background: There are many reasons for contraceptive non-use. While the authors do note a lot of them, the way this is presented is confusing. Also, I was under the impression this paper is about unintended pregnancies, not just non-use of contraception. Methods: There are missing details. Why were the facilities included chosen? Where in the facility were women recruited? How were they consented? It says "exit interviews", but doesn't say exiting from what. It is stated that interviews were conducted "privately", but does not state where these occurred. Results: Many of the results are presented in the tables. They don't need to be repeated in the text, and certainly not the response rate for each question. In the narrative of the results, there is different information than what is presented in the tables. For example, in the tables, why is age broken up into under and over 20? With so few in the under 20 group, this doesn't tell us much about the age distribution of the sample. Similarly, with education parity, gravity, and gestational age: why did the authors dichotomize these in the tables, but present the full range, mean, and standard deviation in the text? It is written that participants were asked about their satisfaction with abortion services. So, are these participants all post-abortion? Discussion and conclusion: This needs to be substantially fleshed out.	The grammatical errors have been corrected. We did not break the introduction up, but methods have been broken up. The abstract has been rewritten. Unintended pregnancies are caused by non-use or misuse of contraceptives and as such when we talk about unintended pregnancies, there is the need to also look at the causes. The study setting explains why the facilities were chosen. Exit interviews have been removed. We think there should be little explanation to the table and that have been done before each table is presented. The difference in information have been corrected in the paper. Abortion issues have been removed. More information has been added to the discussion.
Minor REVISION comments	The abstract states that ½ of unintended pregnancies end in abortion, while the background section states that 38% of all pregnancies are unintended and 22% aborted. That is closer to 2/3 that ½. Results: Income is reported in Table 2. I believe it should be in Table 1.	This discrepancy has been corrected. Income has been move to Table 1
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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