

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_101955
Title of the Manuscript:	Major depression in the antenatal period in the core Niger Delta area of Nigeria; a neglected area of practice.
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.journalajpcb.com/index.php/AJPCB/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Major depression in the antenatal period in the core Niger Delta area of Nigeria, a neglected area of practice. The above manuscript is very relevant and will help the scientific community and National and international policymakers formulate policies to prevent and treat Depression during antenatal and postnatal women. Yes, Topic is Excellent Yes. Subsections are well managed. Yes, scientific sound with good analysis. yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is fairly good and have been corrected for authors.	
Optional/General comments	I have corrected a few sentences and checked spelling and corrected. Authors are requested to again check	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rajesh Jain
Department, University & Country	India