

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_98494
Title of the Manuscript:	AMREF Awareness Creation Campaign and Reduction of Obstetrics Fistula Stigma: Evidence from Misungwi District, Tanzania
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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is important for the scientific community</p> <p>The title of the manuscript is suitable</p> <p>The abstract does not capture the results obtained from the study.</p> <p>The authors should ensure that they followed the format as provided for the journal by adequately arranging the manuscript as under the given titles: Introduction, Methodology, Results, Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendation.</p> <p>Results were also not properly presented. Authors must review this section. Methodology is unclear, Introduction was long drawn out with many repeated details.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references used are mostly older than 10 years. The earliest references cited are still more than 7 years. The authors should endeavor to find recent references related to the topic</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Authors should ensure that the manuscript is properly edited by a professional to eliminate the many grammatical errors</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors should endeavor to avoid needless repetition of facts and simply state the points The significance of the study should not only be to collect data for campaign planning and strategy but to also offer assistance to the affected individuals.</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Martha Orendu Oche Attah
Department, University & Country	Cyprus International University, Cyprus