

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_100171
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH TEENAGE PREGNANCY IN AHAFO ANO SOUTH EAST DISTRICT
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)
<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. Yes, the manuscript is quite important for the scientific community especially on this emerging threat to the education of girl child. Here in Africa, more research on teenage pregnancy, challenges, spread and curbing it, is a plus in fostering girl child education and eradication of intergenerational poverty.</p> <p>2. The title is not such captive; the author should think of improving it.</p> <p>3. NO. The abstract is a bit shallow especially on results and data. Provide more analysis and data for your findings</p> <p>4. YES</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct it only require some minor changes to perfect it</p> <p>6. The references are recent and relevant.</p> <p>7. Let the author try to bring out the statement of the problem clearly. A number of research on the same area exist, I could wish the other come clear on how different this research is different from one in existence. The title should be changed.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The author should check some omissions and grammatical errors to enhance the quality of the manuscript.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The manuscript is fairly good	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nathan Oigo Mokaya
Department, University & Country	Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya