



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_27673
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception, Attitude and Satisfaction of Women with Focused Antenatal Care in Ondo State, 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Introduction - Line 48, pg 2. FANC DOES NOT eliminate risk assessment, BUT is done for low-risk parturients and high risk ones will need to be seen more often - Introduction is too long and should be more focused on acceptability of FANC, hypothesis, objective and justification of the study. Method - Ethical approval and consent not clear - Describe in details sample size calculation and sampling technique - Any inclusion or exclusion criteria? - Data analysis plan was not explicit Result - Mean$\pm$SD should be determined for numerical variables and statistical significance determined so as to know whether the two groups are comparable - Too long, largely because the authors narrated their tables. Results should be written in at most 5 sentences and every other thing should go to the table Discussion - Too long and not focused on findings - Comparison with other literatures was inadequate - Implication for future research not clearly stated Conclusion/Recommendation	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	1. Inappropriate 2. Too long 3. Any limitation? References Update references Ethical approval and consent not clear	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract 1. Use "focused group discussion" NOT "focused group technique" or "focused group interview" 2. Use "purposive" or "convenience" NOT both at the same time 3. Conclusion is inappropriate	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Follow journal instruction. Revise accordingly!	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Emmanuel Ajuluchukwu Ugwa
Department, University & Country	Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA