



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	

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>The theme is important. I have some advices.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: line 4-6 should be incorporated in subheadings. Two statements do not accord each other, and thus please modify them. Two statements are: "Elderly primigravidae showed a higher incidence of preterm labour, low birth weight neonates" "The obstetric outcome is good if utilization of antenatal care is adequate and labour properly conducted by skilled attendants." 2. Line 94: "Women at the extremes of reproductive life (≤ 19 and ≥ 35) years were very few in this centre at 5.8% and 4.5% respectively. Majority of the women (89.7%) having their first childbirth were in the age group 20-34 years." Please delete this sentence because you stated the same just above. 3. Line 101: "The control group was more likely to be married at the time of their first pregnancy than the elderly primigravidae and the teenage primigravidae (96.5%, 91.3% and 51.8% respectively)." Please reconfirm if this is right: 96.5>91.3!! (You deployed, or should deploy throughout the manuscript, the percentage in the order of elderly, teenager, and 20-34). Line 107, 108, you deployed percentage as such! 4. Line 198: "The study showed that pregnancies and deliveries at the extreme ages of reproductive life, if properly conducted, are safe and that there is no significant added perinatal morbidity and mortality in teenage and elderly primigravidae compared with the younger ideal age group." Please reconfirm if this statement is right. You stated that elderly showed poorer outcome in some results/variables. 5. Line 214: "This study also found that, though preterm delivery continues to be a problem in these groups of patients, many of the hazards of pregnancies were no greater than those in the general population." Here, you state the data "correctly". I mean that this statement is lacking in your statement that I pointed out in my point 1 and 4 (above). 6. Line 216: "The obstetric outcome was good if utilization of antenatal care was adequate and the labour properly supervised." This was not confirmed in this study. If antenatal care was adequate and if labor was supervised adequately are unclear in this study. Change this expression. This holds true all throughout the manuscript. <p>Well written. Some minor change is needed.</p>	<p>Corrections at lines 28-20 and 243-244.</p> <p>Deleted.</p> <p>Corrections at line 119</p> <p>Statement reviewed at lines 28-30 and 243-244.</p> <p>Noted with thanks.</p> <p>Statement reviewed throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>Thank you for such a detailed and helpful review of the article.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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