

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_87008
Title of the Manuscript:	Appraisal of Practice and some Socio-Economic Factors on the Utilization of Family Planning Methods in 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://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This study employs a Questionnaire to appraise utilization of family planning in selected provinces of Nigeria. The style of writing requires to focus on the aims of the study.</p> <p>The Introduction gives a background of the situation in Nigeria and justifies the need for increased utilization of family planning to reduce maternal morbidity and mortality. It is not common to include Figures in this section as is written in reports and textbooks . Providing relevant information with references should suffice. (Fig 2 & 3 do not have legends for the X-Y axis).</p> <p>The objectives of the study have been clearly stated.</p> <p>Materials and Methods This should be under one section (materials & methods).</p> <p>The whole study is based on a questionnaire. Convenient sampling appears to be utilized. The authors need to focus on specifics of the questionnaire and sampling. As this is KAP (knowledge, attitude and practice) study, details and clarifications are required . Clearly document the aspects of KAP studied detailing the number of questions for each of the study. An appendix of the questionnaire should be attached. Additionally indicate how the questionnaire was validated. The duration (time) of administering the questionnaire to th subjects should be stated.</p> <p>Define the variables employed (what is meant by fatality, fecundity etc). How was economic status determined etc.,</p> <p>Language is an issue in such studies, indicate how this was overcome.</p> <p>Informed consent for entry to the study should be stated.</p> <p>As this is a cross-sectional study, this should be stated too. How were subjects recruited (this would influence the validity of the findings)? What were the inclusion and exclusion criteria? Women who had hysterectomy and menopause should not be included in the recruitment process.</p> <p>Indicate how the sample size was calculated.</p> <p>Results The tabulation is acceptable. Avoid term 'whopping'.</p> <p>The number of subjects recruited should be stated. Were all questionnaires completely entered for analysis. Indicate how data were derived, entered and analysed. Was SPSS or Excel used for data entry and analysis?</p> <p>Discussion The discussion is satisfactory; comparison with related studies have been stated. In the background/literature search, the authors should indicate how information about family planning is disseminated to the community. One cannot assume that listening to the radio and television, sufficient dissemination occurs. In most instances , the public health and medical personnel are involved in provision of information.</p> <p>Conclusions and Recommendation The conclusions drawn are valid but there are huge limitations in this study as the sample is not representative of the community. The authors are required to state the limitations of the study.</p> <p>It is also important to include a statement if this study was approved by the Review Board of the Institute and source of funding (if applicable).</p> <p>References are written in APA style. Follow the suggested style (of the Journal).</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract There is an irrelevant statement in the abstract – proof read Conclusion should be added</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>This submission needs major revision especially in relation to the study design. Additionally the authors must get approval from relevant REVIEW Board and also indicate if funding was sourced.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i></p> <p>There is no mention if this study was approved by a REVIEW INSTITUTE Consent from subjects should be sought. Details of recruitment of subjects are required.</p>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sivalingam Nalliah
Department, University & Country	International Medical University, Malaysia