



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_39726
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF SOCIO DEMOGRAPHIC AND INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS ON UTILIZATION OF ANTENATAL CARE SERVICES AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN IN DAMATURU, YOBE 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>)

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	- Kindly reframe the sentence on line 41 and 42 until it's meaningful. - On line 60, kindly change the heading from 'methodology' to 'Research Method'. - Under your Research Method, you don't have to show us the rough work of your sample size calculation. Just tell us your sample size and what method or whose formula you used in calculating it, then you can tell us how you were able to cater for attrition. - Your Result of findings is too voluminous. - Your discussion of findings too is too voluminous. Kindly bring out the novel discoveries and succinctly explain it.	Done Done The calculation was removed but it was deemed necessary to explain the variables in the formula in order to justify the sample size arrived. Reducing any part of the result will compromise the findings. Same thing for the discussion. Moreover, the other reviewer highly recommend the discussion.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Ethical issues: Yes, the author didn't state if any ethical commission was taken from the hospital of state board of the area and it wasn't stated as well whether the subjects who were humans were coerced into participation or they filled an informed consent form.	Added after conclusion
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I want to commend the effort of the author. You have really done a great job, the research design/method is alright and the result will immensely contribute to scholarship. Just make the few corrections stated above and you are good to go.	