

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_94104
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON HYSTEROSALPINGOGRAPHY FINDINGS BETWEEN YOUNG-AGED AND MIDDLE-AGED WOMEN AT TERTIARY HEALTH FACILITY IN NIGER-DELTA REGION.
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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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																										
Minor REVISION comments	<div style="text-align: right;">1. All</div> <table border="1"> <caption>Percentage of findings by age group</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>≤ 35 years</th> <th>> 35 years</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Synechia</td> <td>18.0%</td> <td>14.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Smooth filling defects/myoma</td> <td>33.8%</td> <td>35.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tubal occlusion</td> <td>37.6%</td> <td>58.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hydrosalpinx</td> <td>15.8%</td> <td>11.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cervical stenosis</td> <td>1.5%</td> <td>4.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cervical enlargement</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cervical Polyps</td> <td>0.8%</td> <td>0.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>figures with histograms are missing the deviations (deviation, or standard error of the mean 2. It would be interesting to propose a hypothesis of the cause or causes of the results obtained and discuss it.</p>	Category	≤ 35 years	> 35 years	Synechia	18.0%	14.3%	Smooth filling defects/myoma	33.8%	35.3%	Tubal occlusion	37.6%	58.6%	Hydrosalpinx	15.8%	11.3%	Cervical stenosis	1.5%	4.5%	Cervical enlargement	0%	0.8%	Cervical Polyps	0.8%	0.8%	
Category	≤ 35 years	> 35 years																								
Synechia	18.0%	14.3%																								
Smooth filling defects/myoma	33.8%	35.3%																								
Tubal occlusion	37.6%	58.6%																								
Hydrosalpinx	15.8%	11.3%																								
Cervical stenosis	1.5%	4.5%																								
Cervical enlargement	0%	0.8%																								
Cervical Polyps	0.8%	0.8%																								
Optional/General comments																										

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lyda Yuliana Parra Forero
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Colombia