

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_113553
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF PRIMARY CAESAREAN SECTION DELIVERIES AMONG PRIMIGRAVIDA AND MULTIPAROUS WOMEN IN A TERTIARY HEALTH FACILITY IN NIGERIA.
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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Abstract is parsed together from statements lifted directly from the introduction and should be re-written, citation should be removed from abstract and list of abbreviation positioned below the abstract</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, although, several aspects should be corrected as will be listed below: Primigravida is indicated in figure 2 as a separate column and also indicated are women who have only one child. Are the two not mutually inclusive? There should be a separate graph representing multiparity and primagravida in the current study Same observation is observed in figure 3 where the mode of birth is indicated and primigravida is seen as a section of the pie chart</p> <p>The referencing style is haphazard and one style should be adopted and stuck with. More citation is required in the introduction</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No. There are so many grammatical errors. Authors should fix this	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Manuscript needs to be rewritten to reflect the observations made above Authors should be consistent with the dollar value of the cost of CS in all naira figures provided Authors should attempt explain why there is such a wide difference in the cost of CS in the response of the respondents	

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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

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