

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_89329
Title of the Manuscript:	SERO-PREVALENCE OF SYPHILIS AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN ATTENDING ANTENATAL CLINIC IN DOGON AGOGO PRIMARY HEALTH CARE CENTRE JOS NORTH, PLATEAU STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research Study

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.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/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	<p>Abstract Very Poor abstract This is because a good abstract should give a succinct account of the objectives, methods, results and significance of the matter. The structured abstract for an Original Research article should consist of six paragraphs labelled Background, Aim, Setting, Methods, Results and Conclusion. What this author is presenting is far short of this requirement</p> <p>Introduction: Poorly organized introduction. The introduction must contain your argument for the social and scientific value of the study, as well as the aim and objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your argument should be supported by use of evidence from the literature. • Scientific value should make a clear and logical argument for the originality of the study. This should include a summary of what is already known about the research question (NONE HERE), and should clarify the knowledge gap that this study will address. Your argument should be supported by use of evidence from the literature. • Ethical considerations: Where is the ethical consideration (how it was obtained, from the author's institution or other relevant ethics committee and the institution's name and permit numbers should be stated here. THIS IS VERY IMPORTANT <p>Discussion: Your discussion section should address the following four elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarise the key findings without reiterating details of the results. • Explain how the key findings relate to previous research or to existing knowledge, practice or policy. • Describe the strengths and limitations of your methods and what the reader should take into account when interpreting your results. • State the implications of your study or recommendations for future research (Questions that remain unanswered), policy or practice. Make sure that the Recommendations flow directly from your findings. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Data analysis: You should describe how data were captured, checked and cleaned. Describe the analysis process,</p> <p>The tables were not properly formatted</p>	
Optional/General comments	A very poor research study (The author lack the basic principle of a research	

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?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>Yes the Ethic Clearance Please</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Stephen Olorunfemi
Department, University & Country	University of Stellenbosch Cape Town South Africa, Queen Mamohato Hospital Teaching Hospital, Southern Africa