

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ARJGO_79477 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | CERVICAL INSUFFICIENCY AND PERINATAL OUTCOME IN A TERTIARY HOSPITAL IN YENAGOA, SOUTH-SOUTH, 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.journalarjgo.com/index.php/ARJGO/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) |
|--|--|---|
| <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is necessary to apply for ethical clearance to the ethics committee so that there is evidence that the research carried out does not violate ethics to protect the subject and avoid conflicts of interest, proof of an ethical pass certificate can be written down with the certificate number. 2. The research methodology section needs to be completed related to the research design, the research process from the initial sample selection to data collection. The sample count is calculated by what formula is described. 3. In the discussion chapter, to add each characteristic of the research results, an analysis of the discussion is carried out one by one (can be compared with the results of previous studies, existing theories) looking for gaps then a complete and detailed discussion is carried out. 4. Conclusions need to be adjusted to the answers to the research objectives that have been formulated | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | In the discussion or discussion section, it is necessary to explain one by one the results of the research obtained | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | In general, the research results are quite good. | |

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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: | Wijayanti |
| Department, University & Country | Universitas Kusuma Husada Surakarta, Indonesia |