

GPH Review Form

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJRMMS_1605
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF CHLAMYDIA INFECTION AND ASSOCIATED FACTORS AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN ATTENDING ANTENATAL IN TERTIARY HEALTH INSTITUTIONS IN ANAMBRA
Type of the Article	PREVALENCE STUDY

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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://globalpresshub.com/index.php/AJRMMS/editorial-policy)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1(10-04-2018)



GPH Review Form

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with
Compulsory DEVISION companie	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		
 Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Is the title of the article suitable? 	Yes it is important for scientific community because it highlights the importance of tertiary level healthcare so that disabilities and permanent functional consequences can be	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	minimized. This study highlights the pregnant population and prevalence of Chlamydia in this specific population. This study has potential to fill the gap in research regarding similar articles.	
Yes, it is	It sould be PREVALENCE OF OUR AMAYDIA	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It could be PREVALENCE OF CHLAMYDIA INFECTION AND ASSOCIATED FACTORS AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN ATTENDING ANTENATAL CARE PROGRAMS IN TERTIARY	
E. De veu think the manuscript is esigntifically correct?	HEALTH INSTITUTIONS IN ANAMBRA	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Limitations can be added as a booding	
Yes, it is 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Limitations can be added as a heading. Keywords should follow alphabetical order Discussion should demonstrate compare and	
It will be more accurate if limit of references will be 20. More than 50% references fall within recent 5 years.	contrast method.	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes	
	Some Modifications require	
	YES	
	YES	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1(10-04-2018)



GPH Review Form

Optional/General comments Results can be presented in better way by scientific comparisons of highest values of variables if feasible.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sibgha Anum
Department, University & Country	Sechenov Medical University, Moscow

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1(10-04-2018)