

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_122557
Title of the Manuscript:	Medical demography and access to prenatal care in the Foubot agricultural production basin (West Cameroon)
Type of the 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)
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 subject is all the more important and topical in Africa, which suffers cruelly from a shortage of health resources, but also from their unequal distribution between rural and urban areas. The few health human resources that exist, particularly specialists, are concentrated more in the cities and avoid remote areas because of the poor living and working conditions and the low benefits of working in rural areas. This situation is at the root of health inequalities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In my humble opinion, the title needs to be revisited. The author could confine himself to talking about access to antenatal care in the agricultural production basin of Foubot (West Cameroon).	
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 summary is good and includes all the parts and information needed to understand the article, but it is a little too long (over 400 words). It is always better for the summary to be as concise as possible and to concentrate on the essentials in 200-300 words. A few extra sentences should be removed from the introduction, methodology and results, and reduced to 250 words at most.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate. However, the author has not been able to bring out clearly the methodology, methods and techniques of data collection. No details on ethical principles.	
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.	The topic addressed by the researcher is relevant, but he did not apply scientific rigour in discussing the results. It should be noted that the results are not compared with other previous studies or data in the existing literature. The methodology is poorly described and unclear.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The article is very poorly referenced, particularly in the discussion of results, and the author is encouraged to make a little more effort by consulting much more scientific search engines such as PubMed, Google Scholar, Semantic Scholar, Académia, etc. for more recent results on the subject in question. It is possible that the author will find results dating back less than 10 years, or even five years if he or she does the search properly.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the language is acceptable to a diverse readership	
Optional/General comments	The article needs to be improved in terms of methodology, but more in terms of discussion of the results. The conclusion should be concise and consistent with the results. The author is invited to improve the methodology by providing a little more clarity on the data collection methods and techniques; the sample selection criteria and procedures; and the ethical considerations of the study. The overall discussion of the results should be justified in comparison with previous studies available in the literature and the most recent, dating from the last 5 years if possible.	

Review Form 3

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:	Kafumbi Katsiatsia Joel
Department, University & Country	Institut Supérieur des Techniques Médicales, Democratic Republic of Congo