



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>)



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	Abstract Line 7: "...Like Nigeria, most of which were associated..." should read "...like Nigeria where most of them were associated..." Line 10- "A descriptive survey study was carried out..." should read "...a descriptive study was carried out...". the word survey and study should not be in one sentence. In addition, the whole paper talks about the study. Line 16-21- This is one paragraph of the results and therefore, capital letters should be removed even though they refer to different results. Line 24- key words Update the key words to indicate those words that appear most in the abstract. I suggest the following words- Antenatal services, study, health facilities and pregnant women. References- reference numbering are inserted after the statements running through the document. I suggest a revision. For example, line 33 to read "...both mother and child [1,2,3]. The availability..." Line 37- To read "...either normal risk or high risk [2]. Most women..." Line 54-58: Aims and objectives The whole paragraph states the objectives in present tense as a proposal and not a study already carried out in the past and therefore generating a paper. This section should be revised. Methodology Line 65- should read- women who could not read/understand English language. Study population Line 69- should read "women in the reproductive age in Damaturu were 19,569 4]. The study is in the past and therefore avoids use of present tense in this paragraph. Line 82- change the tense from "...for this study is 185..." to "...for this study was 185..." Line 124- Table 2 What is prepare TBA? Not clear. Do you mean "Prefer TBAs?"	All comments acknowledged and effected except the comment I highlighted in red, which I disagree. As per as I know Vancouver referencing come with citations after punctuation mark. I did the same thing in my previous publication with you, but if that's a new rule for your journal, you let me know.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	I enjoyed reading the discussion section. Very informative and easy to read and understand	

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>