

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_103543
Title of the Manuscript:	Labour pain Perceptions and Experiences among Postpartum Mothers in two selected Public Health Facilities in Rivers State: A Mixed Method Study
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>First all, I would appreciate the invitation offered to me review this manuscript. Thanks a lot</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound and has a great contribution to the scientific community. 2. The title is suitable and interesting, current issue and informative. 3. Yes, the manuscript has a comprehensive abstract. But the study period was not described in the manuscript. 4. No. THE AUTHORS need to follow the journal's manuscript submission guideline. For example, subsections like objectives, theoretical frameworks (can be described in introduction section), etc must be removed from the manuscript. The introduction is too long, could be summarized and minimized into 1^{1/2} pages. 5. Yes 6. Yes, most of them are recent. There are also outdated references even back in 2001 <p><u>Additional comments</u> Overall, give line numbers so that it would be easy for the review process. Methods and material section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors applied convergent mixed design while conducting the study. Would you describe why and how you apply this design? 2. The study area should be described clearly. Where exactly the conducted? Describe the country in which the study area located, the population coverage, the different levels of health facilities found in the study area, number of health facilities which provide the services under study. How many hospitals are found in the study area? Describe the services given in the selected facilities, population coverage, the number of beds it occupies. 3. The study period of the research was not mentioned. 4. Clearly describe the source population, study population and eligibility criteria. The authors described "...those who had emergency C-sections after laboring for a while.". this need further clarification. What would you mean by <i>for a while</i>? Which one did you include, those who experience labor until which stage of labor? I think the severity of labor depends on the stages of labor. 5. Exclusion criteria: I think elective C-Section were not included in your study at the beginning. A study participant should be eligible to be included at the beginning to be excluded. 6. The authors proportionally allocate the number of postnatal mothers for each hospital based on the birth rates from the previous studies. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If there is a previous study in the same facilities, what is the need to repeat the study again? b. What is the total number of postnatal mothers in each hospital during the study period? c. If you select the participants consecutively, what do you think about the generalizability of your study findings? 7. What are the variables in your study: dependent and independent variables? 8. Operation definition described in the manuscript are just the definition of terms, not operation definition. How do you measure severity of pain, which tool did you use, how you classify the experience? What is booking status? 9. Methods of data collection/Instrumentation section: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Who are your data collectors, how do you minimize social desirability bias 	

	<p>and recall bias?</p> <p>b. When was the data collected? Was it when the mother was on labor or after delivery? I think you collected your data in postnatal time. But you said “The VAS was administered after the 2nd stage of labour due to the peculiarities of the cohort of participants by the lead researcher and trained assistants within 6 - 12 hours of delivery.”?? How do you reconcile these?</p> <p>10. What are the Strategies the authors applied to improve internal consistency (reliability)? What is the Cronbach alpha of the tool you used?</p> <p>11. How using correct approved sampling technique ensures the external validity of your tool?</p> <p>12. Qualitative research rigour: The authors need to describe the specific strategies they practically apply to ensure the credibility, transferability and dependability of the results. “appropriate study environment???(where is the appropriate environment?), participants (who are the appropriate participants???), and data collection approach(which approach you followed?); prolonged engagement, triangulation (what do you mean by this?), peer-briefing, negative case analysis?????, and member checks. To ensure transferability, thick descriptions were used to present findings. Strategies to ensure dependability included an audit trail which will allow other researchers to follow the ‘decision trail’ used by the researchers and conformability ensured by the use of personal notes which detailed impressions and decisions made along the research path to enable the researchers focus on the end product and find conclusions grounded in the data rather than personal interests and biases.????????</p> <p>13. The authors performed Pearson’s chi-square and binary logistic regression, how did you control the confounding effect?</p> <p>14.</p> <p>Results section: Needs major revision Your study design is convergent parallel design, but your study results are described separately. ??????How do you justify this inconsistency? I recommend to write them simultaneously by writing the quantitative findings first and supporting the quantitative results with the findings from the qualitative.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “The section describes the characteristics of the postpartum mothers and narrates how the respondents perceived their labour pain. It highlights how they described labour pain in their own words and their concerns. It also highlights how the postpartum mothers labour pain perception was affected by their desires, knowledge and attitude of pain relief in their own words.”. REMOVE THIS PARAGRAPH (P-7). 2. Characteristics of participants participants described in the paragraph on page 7, reduce the amount information described in the paragraph and put the others in the table. 3. Table 1: put the findings in frequencies and percentage. 4. REWRITE the qualitative study findings in a summarized and scientifically sound way. 5. Quantitative result <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The author classified socioeconomic status as “LOW, MIDDLE and HIGH” how did you classify that? What is your cut off point? Which tool did you use? Have you used wealth index? b. The results were not summarized and interpreted in a scientifically sound way. All the information in the table were described again in the paragraph. Rewrite the result. c. Table labelling: use appropriate labelling system for tables and figures. (what, when and where) d. In the table 4 blood pressure level are classified as “normotensive and hypertensive”. How authors determine blood level as normotensive or hypertensive? Why hypotensive are avoided? At what time was the BP measured, postpartum or during labour? e. Table 5 labelling, should not be included in the table. f. Put the 95% CI estimates of your results. Eg. Overall percentage of severe labor pain, Chi-squares, g. The results of logistic regression were not presented. 6. Discussion: needs major revision 	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. In paragraph 3 of discussion section, the authors provided a single justification for findings of both higher and lower studies. You should provide separate justifications for each discrepancy. b. The authors repeatedly use reference number 27 as a comparison, which a similar study conducted in a same setting as the current one. That means the problem is already known and studied. Then what different evidence does the current study add to the scientific community? c. Paragraph 5, line 9 incomplete statement. A study by ?? [34] in south Africa... d. The discussion is shallow, it should not be the repetition of the results. It is not well argued against the available evidences with possible rationale for the similarities, and discrepancies. e. Paragraph 6 looks like the repetition of results. f. Paragraph 7 needs citation g. Very few of your quantitative findings is supported by the findings from qualitative study. The qualitative findings were not discussed, or used as justification for the quantitative result. Needs revision. h. Discuss all your findings. Eg. The result of factors/relationship between your variables. <p>7. Rewrite the limitation in a clear and understandable grammar 8. Recommendation and contribution to body of knowledge: summarize and integrate into discussion section. 9. References: use appropriate reference writing style. Eg. Ref # 16</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but a lot of punctuation and grammar error.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Gamechu Atomsa Hunde</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>School of Nursing, Jimma University, Ethiopia</p>