



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_47518
Title of the Manuscript:	PICA PRACTICE AND ASSOCIATED FACTORS AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN RECEIVING ANTENATAL CARE IN OBIO COTTAGE HOSPITAL, PORT HARCOURT, RIVERS STATE
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:

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

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	To authors, The theme dealt here is important. I have never read this comprehensive study regarding pica. Although I believe that this manuscript is too long, I agree with this length if the authors consider that this length is mandatory to explain things. I believe that this study/paper contributes to medical and political policy making not only in this specific area but also everywhere else. I have some minor advice. 1. Please define (explain) "pica" in the first sentence of the Abstract. Line 22: please explain "fetus sex": readers cannot understand it. 2. Line 55: missing parenthesis. 3. Some references cannot be retrieved (for example 8). If the references are not from Journal, please cite its net address (URL) as detail as possible, which is beneficial for readers.	Thank you for your review comments and advice. 1. PICA has been explained and foetus sex has been clarified. 2. Parenthesis has been fixed where missing. 3. References has been reviewed and rectified.
Minor REVISION comments	The study is worthy. If I would have written this one, I may have written this by 1/2. But, demanding reduction may destroy the present paper structure.	It was written in a way for readers to have good understanding of the study.
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	