

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_103443
Title of the Manuscript:	Furghanization of Surrogacy
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.journalarjgo.com/index.php/ARJGO/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1) More field work required to validate the article for public consumption</p> <p>2) The title is not suitable Proposal- The Impact Of Religion On Surrogacy As An Alternative To Infertility Problems Among Couples In Furghan</p> <p>3) The abstract needs more modification. The key words of the abstract not included and the methods of the field work not well summarized in the abstract.</p> <p>4) The outline and the subsections are correct and appropriate for this article</p> <p>5) The article needs more field work and modifications before validation</p> <p>6) some of the references are not recent reasons might be due to limited research in this area but not withstanding the author should search for more up to date articles.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	NOT STANDARD MORE CORRECTIONS NEEDED	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>If the author's intention is to study how religion do influence decision making with regards to taking up surrogacy as an alternative to infertility among couples in Furghan. Then the author should take into consideration the other religion types at the site of study</p> <p>-Catholics -Protestants -Muslims Etc.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Samka Peregrine Maishu
Department, University & Country	Government Bilingual High School, Cameroon