

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_101466
Title of the Manuscript:	CAESAREAN DELIVERY ON MATERNAL REQUEST: PERSPECTIVE OF PREGNANT WOMEN FROM SOUTHERN 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:

(<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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the manuscript important for scientific community</li> <li>- the title of the article need to clarify dependent and independent variable, and suggest change to ( knowledge and perception of pregnant women from southern Nigeria about cesarean delivery ) or pregnant women's awareness about caesarean delivery: A descriptive, cross-sectional study.</li> <li>- the abstract of the article is not comprehensive</li> <li>- subsections and structure of the manuscript not appropriate</li> <li>- Research question not written</li> <li>- Methods incomplete</li> <li>- Tool for data need More clarification and explanation, explain scoring system</li> <li>- Format</li> <li>- References are outdated and need updating</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes the article language/English quality suitable for scholarly communications	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Azza Abdalsemia Elewa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Helwan University, Egypt</b>