

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_126947
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge, Attitude, and Perception of Women to Cesarean-Section: A Cross-sectional study among Deltan Women
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses an important public health issue by exploring the knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of cesarean section among Deltan women in Nigeria, a population where maternal healthcare practices can be significantly influenced by cultural beliefs and access to information. The study's findings contribute valuable insights for designing effective educational interventions that could improve maternal-fetal outcomes. Additionally, this research fills a gap in the literature on maternal health perceptions in West Africa, providing data that can inform policymakers and healthcare providers. I appreciate the study's relevance and the potential impact it may have on maternal health strategies in the region. the importance of our research on cesarean section perceptions among Deltan women. We will address the recommended changes in the manuscript and highlight the revised sections for clarity. We aim to ensure that this study not only contributes to scientific understanding but also provides practical implications for improving healthcare services in Nigeria.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is informative but could be made more specific to better reflect the study's focus on knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions toward cesarean sections among Deltan women in Nigeria. <i>"Knowledge, Attitudes, and Perceptions of Cesarean Section Among Women in Delta State, Nigeria: Implications for Maternal Health Interventions."</i> The title of the article is informative but could be made more specific to better reflect the study's focus on knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions toward cesarean sections among Deltan women in Nigeria. <i>"Knowledge, Attitudes, and Perceptions of Cesarean Section Among Women in Delta State, Nigeria: Implications for Maternal Health Interventions."</i>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, covering the objectives, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, covering the objectives, methodology, key findings, and conclusions.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, presenting a logical flow that guides the reader through the research objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions. The structure is well-organized, supporting readability and comprehension. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, presenting a logical flow that guides the reader through the research objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions. The structure is well-organized, supporting readability and comprehension.	

Review Form 3

<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its well-defined methodology, appropriate statistical analysis, and clear presentation of results. The authors employ established analytical methods that are well-suited for the study objectives, lending credibility to their findings. The manuscript addresses potential limitations transparently, indicating a thoughtful approach to research design. Overall, the work provides a solid contribution to the field, supported by accurate data analysis and coherent discussion.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in this manuscript are generally sufficient and relevant, covering key studies that align with the research focus. Most references are recent and reflect current advancements in the field, which strengthens the manuscript's context and validity.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the manuscript is generally adequate for academic communication, with the use of appropriate technical terms and a clear structure. However, there are a few minor issues that need attention:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some sentences are overly complex and could be simplified for better clarity. For example, "The analysis was carried out to identify the underlying factors that influence the results observed across different regions" could be rephrased to "The analysis identified factors influencing results across regions." 2. Minor grammatical errors such as subject-verb agreement issues and inconsistent use of tenses (e.g., using past and present tense interchangeably) should be corrected. 3. There are occasional awkward phrasing or redundancies, such as "due to the fact that" which can simply be "because." 	
<p>Optional/General comments</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Alfonso Vallejos Parás</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social, Mexico</p>