



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_40680
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Induced Abortion Amongst Women Attending Antenatal Care Services in a Tertiary Health Institution in Nigeria.
Type of the 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	Background: This is not usually stated in conventional journal writing . The contents relate to research questions. These should be itemised as such and included under Methods. Much of the statement under background on the subject of termination of pregnancy can be included under INTRODUCTION. METHOD: This section is too short. State that this was convenient sampling, state what statistical methods were used, make a note of the termination of pregnancy method usually employed in Nigeria. Make a statement of how the questionnaire was developed, and if they addressed all the research questions stated under Background. The study should be approved by the Institutional Review Board- make a note of that. Was language a problem, how were the questionnaire administered and how long did it take to complete each (these are ethical issues and will affect response). Where was it administered ? Make a note if it was piloted and if validated – be explicit how this was done. A comment was made Under Discussion /Table : D&C –does the client know what this is and if she can understand the instrumentation used ? RESULTS; All tables must be formatted properly. Some of the titles need to be changed as stated under comments. Line 138: avoid giving a mean for parity –state the mean in whole numbers. Table 1: Column 3 (what does 148 stand for?) Line 149: State the specific objectives as the discussion appears to be aligned to specific objectives. Title for table is better: Status of marriage and gestational age at termination of pregnancy. Line 151: Grammar to be correted. Line 154: 'while being married' is better Line 159: reconstruct this sentence so the meaning is clear. Line 166: what is Fego pls recalculate? Line 168: Avoid such statement- passive sentence- Line 168: Title: Termination of pregnancy by marriage status and gestational age. Format table Line 178: 'wanted' Line 179: quote (%) and p-value , no need to state the t-valu and DF Line 183: There are 2 redundant statements Table 3 is better to change the questions to variables Line 193- refers to Table 4- better to use the term "Personel performing TOP Table 5 –does the patient understand the term D&C? 232: state the p-value alone 238: 'exists' Discussion: The first paragraph is much too long. The discussion can be shortened based on derived results. Most of the comparison is relevant and well written. Line 290: look at comment. Line 299: Methods used for termination of pregnancy Line 302-303; Check grammar	'Background cancelled from introduction AL reviewer's comments attended to in text. The study was approved by the ethical committee of the Niger Delta University Teaching Hospital, Okolobiri.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 304: Overwhelmingly Line 309- The sentence is too confusing- reconstruct Line 317-19: emotive and not based on results derived Line 338: Conclusion should be re-written to reflect on the study results; what the limitations of the study are , and if further studies are needed for more robust information so as to make policy changes. Ethical issue: State if this study was approved by Institutional Review Board. State that confidentiality issues were addressed under consent taking.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Grammatical errors and check on references	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a good study which reflects on patients abortion practice. The study is based on a questionnaire survey that lends to lack of robustness of the results. The limitations of using a convenient sample and also a questionnaire needs to be reflected under conclusions. There are many comments made in the text to improve the final product. Once revised and limitations of the study state, it may be considered for acceptance by the editorial team. There are some grammatical mistakes that need to be corrected. Some sentences are too long and the meaning is lost as a consequence. These should be reconstructed. The discussion is rather long and many statements are emotive and not drawn from the results of the study. It would be good to focus the discussion based on the objectives of the study.	DONE