



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13357
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS INFLUENCING GESTATIONAL AGE AT BOOKING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PORT HARCOURT TEACHING HOSPITAL SOUTH-SOUTH NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) The abstract is not informative. 2) The data are not well controlled and not robust : In the abstract section, line 16,17,18: 600 pregnant women: 133 of them (22 %) were between 0-14 weeks of gestation. 509 of them (68 %) were between 14-28 weeks of gestation. $509 + 133 = 642$. In addition, in the section of results, line 96,97,98: the authors stated that 133 (22%) had booked before 14th weeks; 409 (68%) booked between 14-28 weeks and 4 (0.7%) booked at 34 weeks of gestation or later. $133 + 409 + 4 = 546$. 4 (0.7%) pregnant women lacked in the part of abstract. Was the total number of pregnant women who involved into the study 600 or 642 or 546???? It should be exactly clarified. 3) The authors stated that “most of these were primigravidae (89.5%)” (line 17). However there was only data as para 1-4 about parity in Table 1. Para 1-4 should be classified as para 1 (primigravidae) and para 2-3-4. 4) Line 65: the authors stated “ the participants were selected by simple random sampling”. The randomisation method? Were there any pregnant women who leaved this study. 5) This is a cross sectional study. The power analysis	Corrected 509 was a typographical error. 409 is correct. Total number of women in the study was 600. Line 17 -19 in the abstract has been rewritten to be clearer. This statement referred to the distribution of women (133, 22%) who booked before 14 weeks gestation. Majority of those who booked early (89.5%) were Primigravida. It had nothing to do with the distribution of parity in the overall study.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of the this study? 6) Line 68: Ethical approval number of the University ? A written informed consent from each patient who participated in this study ? Was this work supported by the any foundation. If yes, project number ? 7) There was a conflict data about the factors influencing the booking of pregnant women. The authors stated that (line 102) « However, planned pregnancy and provision of funds for antenatal care by the husband influenced the booking gestational age ». In contrast, the authors stated that (line 142) However, the husnband's consent and provision of fund for antenatal care did not appear to significantly influence the gestational age at the time of booking. It shuld be clarified. In addition no data about « husband's income » given in the tables. 8) The number of % should be given as 58 % but not 57.9 %. 9) Line 207 : Figure 1 : Missing ????? The total number of pregnant women 600?? In addition, <13 weeks or <14 weeks? The figure 1 should be revised. 10) Line 152, 153: In the part of conclusion, the authors stated that “ the importance of antenatal care in reducing maternal and perinatal morbidity mortality cannot overemphasized.” It's clear that without this study, it can be concluded. There is no new aspect adding to the literature.	Corrected Corrected
--	---	-----------------------------------



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript is either seriously flawed, lack of Novelty or does not provide a useful contribution to its area of research. 1) I mean no. However, Line 68: Ethical approval number of the University ? A written informed consent from each patient who participated in this study ? Was this work supported by the any foundation. If yes, project number ?	No