

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_105570
Title of the Manuscript:	THE KNOWLEDGE AND UTILIZATION OF TRADITIONAL BIRTH ATTENDANTS BY WOMEN IN ALANAMU COMMUNITY OF ILORIN, NORTHERN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research paper

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.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/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>ABSTRACT Refer to journal guidelines on number of words allowed and reporting structure.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION Reduce to 1.5 pages maximum</p> <p>RESULTS Place figure title/legends below figure not inside figure box</p> <p>DISCUSSION Use same sub-headings as used in the results section to: Align the 2 sections Make reader orientation easier Make sure that the sequence of reporting stays the same Make sure that the weightings are correct (many results = long discussion, & vice versa) Paragraph 1: delete – do not need another introduction Paragraph 2 – need extensive discussion via literature Paragraph 3 - show p-values not indicated in results section Paragraph 4 – need extensive discussion via literature Paragraph 4 – need extensive discussion via literature</p> <p>CONCLUSION Delete content and replace with: What were the most outstanding results What are the real world application of the study What are the gaps and limitations of the study What is the holistic conclusion What is the holistic recommendation</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Language is acceptable	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Martin Potgieter
Department, University & Country	University of Limpopo, South Africa