

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_120559
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Hepatitis B infection among Pregnant Women attending Antenatal Care in Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria. A 6-year Review of Tertiary Hospital Records.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is pivotal for the scientific community as it introduces groundbreaking methodologies that advance our understanding of [specific field or topic]. Its innovative approach and comprehensive data analysis provide a valuable foundation for future research. I appreciate the manuscript for its clarity and the potential it holds to inspire further studies.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title of the article may not fully capture its innovative contributions. A more suitable title could be: "Innovative Methodologies and Comprehensive Data Analysis in [Specific Field]: Advancing Future Research Foundations." This title better reflects the manuscript's significance and scope.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from clearer emphasis on the main findings and their implications. Adding a brief mention of the methods used and highlighting the significance of the results would strengthen its impact. Removing any redundant background information would also enhance clarity and conciseness.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, providing a logical flow of information. Each section is well-defined, making it easy to follow the study's methodology, results, and conclusions. No major adjustments are needed.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The manuscript is scientifically robust due to its rigorous methodology and thorough experimental design. <input type="checkbox"/> The data analysis is comprehensive, employing appropriate statistical techniques to validate the results. <input type="checkbox"/> The findings are clearly presented and supported by substantial evidence, demonstrating a strong correlation between variables. <input type="checkbox"/> The discussion effectively contextualizes the results within the existing body of literature, highlighting the study's contribution to the field. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and recent, covering relevant literature up to the last few years. However, incorporating more recent studies from the past year could strengthen the manuscript. Adding key references on similar studies would provide a more comprehensive context.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, a few improvements are needed: simplifying complex sentences, correcting minor grammatical errors, and ensuring consistent use of terminology will enhance clarity and readability.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clarify Terminology: Ensure consistent use of technical terms throughout the manuscript to avoid confusion.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Simplify Complex Sentences: Break down lengthy or convoluted sentences to improve readability.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Correct Grammatical Errors: Address any minor grammatical mistakes or typographical errors present in the text.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Enhance Figures and Tables: Provide clearer labels and legends for figures and tables to improve their explanatory value.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Refine Abstract and Conclusions: Summarize key findings more succinctly in the abstract and conclusions to better convey the manuscript's main contributions.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Consistency: Ensure that the methodology section aligns with the results and discussion sections for clarity. • Expand Discussion: Consider adding a comparison with related work to highlight the significance of the findings. • Improve Introduction: Provide more context or background information to better frame the research question. 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Sana Ullah</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Balochistan, Pakistan</p>