

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_120379
Title of the Manuscript:	A 10 Year Review of the Impact of Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission of HIV in a Tertiary Health Centre, Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria
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://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>

Review Form 3

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 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.	HIV is an important cause of mortality and especially as the authors state the paediatric infections are mostly from mother to child and it is informative to review the impact of intervention on MTCT and fill in the lacunae where they exist in order to bring down MTCT to zero.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the title gives the idea of the research	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive. in this section under the results heading, there is an error. total 2987 women received ART. only 2185 records were retrieved which is approx. 73 %. what is 18 %?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The data analysis shows how the timing of ART and the mode of delivery and infant feeding practises have an impact on MTCT. Some more analysis of the data would have been more useful. the mothers who had elective caesarean had low MTCT, however it is not clear if these mothers also had ART initiated early and had optimal infant feeding practises. Similarly the babies who were breast fed, did the mothers also receive the art early on ?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Useful analysis about the impact of intervention on MTCT	

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:	Manjula Rao
Department, University & Country	Durgabai Deshmukh Hospital, India