

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_106255
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors influencing utilisation of hernia care among women seeking surgical healthcare: A study of a peri-urban health facility in Eastern Ghana
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>This is an interesting manuscript that the authors are attempting to study a particularly important issue in low-and-middle-income countries. The study assessed factors associated with the utilization of quality hernia care among 180 adult females. The title is appropriate and is informative. The abstract is appropriate and inclusive, describing the problem, the way it is addressed, the goals of the study and a brief summary of the results and the conclusion of the study. The structure of the study is appropriate and is scientifically relevant and correct. However, the manuscript is too wordy and needs to be shortened. There is too much repetition of information in every section. There are some issues with location and description of figures and tables. References, pictures, and tables are appropriate.</p> <p>An important issue that should be discussed is the concern of the high prevalence of hernia cases among women in this study. The high percentage of 56% is misleading as those are patients seeking treatment. This does not reflect the prevalence/incidence among women in general population. Also, the reviewer wonders what the authors' rationale of was limited their study to adult women. Why didn't they include men in the study?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	A relevant manuscript that is worthy of publication.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ossama Tawfik
Department, University & Country	MAWD Pathology Group, USA