



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_47865
Title of the Manuscript:	Age at First Birth and Pregnancy Outcomes in Makurdi, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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>Time Frame of Study:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The study has been conducted from patients from 2002 – 2007, which is 17 years from present time. As this is a descriptive study, a data from such a past time can't be generalised to present population due to advancements and changes in healthcare and population dynamics <p>Objective of the Study:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In the last paragraph of Introduction the objective of the study has to be mentioned, this is keeping in with established scientific protocol <p>Representation of data:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Table 1 has no description in the text 2) Table 2 – it would be scientifically more appropriate to represent obstetric characteristics separately for advanced maternal age and teenage pregnancy groups and control groups – this is because outcomes would vary significantly between these three groups and hence their characteristics need to be considered separately 3) Table 3 has no description in the text 4) Table 6 has no description in the text <p>Statistical Tests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The tables 1- 7 have numbers and percentages in them, the P value should be mentioned in the same table to the right sided column 2) The tests that were used to compare the quantitative and qualitative variables between the three groups need to be mentioned, either in the methods or below the tables, as the authors deem appropriate <p>Limitations of the study:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Only parity has been adjusted here from being a confounder by including only Primis, the authors have not mentioned other potential confounders and effect modifiers that could be introducing an unavoidable bias in the study. 	<p>Agreed. Correction effected at lines 232-234 of the corrected manuscript.</p> <p>Corrections at lines 68-71.</p> <p>Corrections at line 99.</p> <p>Corrections at lines 112-113.</p> <p>Corrections at lines 115-121. Corrections at lines 154-172.</p> <p>Corrections effected in all the tables.</p> <p>Corrections at lines 91-93.</p> <p>To be addressed in subsequent study.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Line 15: Out (of) these primiparous <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Line 50 – Placental abruption (spell check) <p>Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Line 84 – Please clarify the terms adequate, inadequate and inappropriate with more clarity 2) Line 96 – Table 2 is mentioned in the text for the first time, Table 1 is not mentioned 3) Table 3 is described as socio biological, there is no biological characteristic described in that table, it should preferably be named socio-economic or social <p>Conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Line 214 – environment (? Population) 	<p>Correction effected..</p> <p>Correction effected.</p> <p>Corrections at lines 89-90.</p> <p>Correction at line 121.</p> <p>Correction at line 241.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Making the study more robust: 1) The study is very appreciable in terms of design and conduct, in order to make it more robust, the authors can calculate the relative risk these extremes of age offer in comparison to control cohort. 2) If being considered, the authors may calculate RR for a) Teenage pregnancy vs. Control and elderly primi vs control 3) Making the study more generalisable to present day by including the recent cohorts f mother involved at the centre.	All these suggestions will be addressed in a subsequent study. Thank you for such detailed and a fair assessment of the article.
---	---	---

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	