



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_49267
Title of the Manuscript:	OPINIONS OF PREGNANT WOMENS INTENDED TO MALE MIDWIVES
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>)



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>This study was conducted to determine opinions of pregnant women on their gender preferences related to accoucheur-midwife profession. The sampling group included 384 pregnant women, and 98.4% of these women preferred assistance from a female midwife.</p> <p>The manuscript is solid. The number of participants is quite low, but it is really uncertain how much the increase in study population will have changed the results. The introduction is too long and should be shortened. Further the Introduction includes some "midwifery liturgy", which seems unnecessary. The Results are what they are, and the Discussion is quite balanced. The References includes too many articles from the home country (Turkey).</p> <p>Some spelling errors should be corrected, i.e. midwives to midwives.</p> <p>The authors write at the end of the Discussion that "obtained study results could be considered as expected results". This is certainly true. However, it is obvious that the results represent more the political (conservative) and educational (low) challenges in Turkey than anything else. The authors should discuss this more.</p>	<p>The introduction is shortened.</p> <p>Spelling errors were corrected</p> <p>The authors discussed this more.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Read above.	
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)	