

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_83288
Title of the Manuscript:	MATERNAL AND NEONATAL CRITERIA FOR KANGAROO MOTHER CARE: THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE MIDWIFE IN THE WEST MAMPRUSI DISTRICT OF NORTH-EAST REGION, GHANA
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.journalajpcb.com/index.php/AJPCB/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>-The quality of the manuscript language is below average according to the results obtained from the levelling software</p> <p>-In the introduction, it is necessary to pay attention to such cases :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate and comprehensive explanation of research variables is not provided</li> <li>• The research problem is not clear</li> <li>• No previous research has been mentioned</li> </ul> <p>-Research logic Thematic content analysis for coding is unclear. Is it deductive, inductive or interrogative?</p> <p>-Demographic characteristics of participants should be explained in the sampling section and the target group</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>-The purpose of the research does not require a separate title</p> <p>-Given that the lived experience of midwives has been studied, so this can be a phenomenological research</p> <p>-Content analysis usually focuses on the text of article documents and books</p> <p>-It is better to answer the research results based on the research questions</p> <p>-Research questions are unclear</p> <p>-The resources used in the old research is best updated</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Text to be edited</p> <p>The unit of analysis in coding is not clear</p> <p>The pattern and method of analysis in coding is not specific</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> This study abided by all the ethical requirements for conducting human research in Ghana. First of all, the researchers committed themselves to the University of Ghana Institutional Review Board, Noguchi Memorial Institute for Medical Research (NMIMR) to seek for an approval before carrying out the study (IRB 00001276, NMIMR-IRB CPN 017/15-16). Apart from this, the researcher also sought approval from the Mamprusi West District Health directorate. The researchers also sought individual consent from the participating midwives who were recruited for this study. They were provided with all the information regarding this study with help of information sheet before they were given the consent form to sign when they agreed to take part in this study.	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zahra Jamebozorg</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Allameh Tabataba'i University, Iran</b>