

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_100641
Title of the Manuscript:	WOMEN'S PERCEPTION OF MENOPAUSE AT A TERTIARY CARE FACILITY IN 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>)

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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The objectives of the article which title 'WOMEN'S PERCEPTION OF MENOPAUSE AT A TERTIARY CARE FACILITY IN NIGERIA' have impact to the social community. It stated in the abstract (paragraph 1) as below: Because of these predicted population structure changes, physicians are beginning to see menopause as a major public health issue. In developing nations like Nigeria, sociocultural and socioeconomic factors strongly influence menopause perception.</p> <p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>The article has no appropriate structures. Unlike the usual theme, this article is more like a thesis or research proposal. A good paragraph has at least a main idea, and it builds by sentences, giving some meaning to readers. I do not find it in this manuscript. I suggest that the author re-write the article and follow the writing rules.</p> <p>In result, table 1 – 6 only explain about characteristic data, I think it has been described correctly. Table 7 a,b 8 a,b explain about association with p value, Some test method are used but the author did not described previously in method. Please described it completely.</p> <p>Reference no. 8 is not fully written. For a good original research article, the number of references is no less than 10, please find more.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Some are suitable unless the author writes about specific word or local language (?)	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still have words "will" sometime because this manuscript copied from the proposal and have not change yet. (delete 'will' in study design and population) • informed consent as part of the inclusion does not need to be rewritten in the exclusion • some word maybe familiar in local community only: Tribe, Igbo, Hausa, Yoruba, author should provide information about it. 	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ignatio Rika Haryono
Department, University & Country	Catholic University of Indonesia, Indonesia