

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is indeed important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the prevalence of primary caesarean section among primigravida and multiparous women in a tertiary health facility in Nigeria. This is a significant topic as it contributes to the broader understanding of maternal health care, particularly in regions where access to such services may be limited. 2. The title of the article seems suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the study. However, it could be more specific. An alternative could be: "Prevalence and Financial Implications of Primary Caesarean Section Among Primigravida and Multiparous Women in a Tertiary Health Facility in Nigeria". 3. The abstract provides a clear overview of the background, objectives, methodology, results, and conclusion of the study. It might be beneficial to include key findings in the abstract for a more comprehensive summary. 4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate and follows a logical flow. Each section is clearly defined and contributes to the overall narrative of the study. 5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The methodology is well explained, and the results are clearly presented. 6. The references seem to be sufficient and relevant to the study. They are appropriately placed within the text. However, it would be beneficial to include more recent references where possible to ensure the study is contextualized within the most up-to-date research. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the article is generally good, but there are a few areas that could benefit from minor revisions for clarity and grammatical correctness. For instance, in the sentence "The study reveals that statistical significance (p=0.04) was seen from the mode of payment delivery and caesarean section out of pocket money was more", it would be clearer to say "The study reveals a statistically significant association (p=0.04) between the mode of payment for delivery and the prevalence of out-of-pocket payments for caesarean sections". It's also important to ensure consistent use of tense throughout the manuscript</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Petca Aida
Department, University & Country	Carol Davila University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania