



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_47573
Title of the Manuscript:	CESAREAN IN ADOLESCENTS AT THE RURAL HOSPITAL OF NEISU (Democratic Republic of Congo): Epidemiological aspects and neonatal and maternal prognosis.
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The theme dealt here is important. I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Abstract : « To determine the epidemiological aspect of cesarean section performed in adolescent girls at Neisu Rural Hospital (DR Congo) and maternal and neonatal prognosis, in order to contribute to the reduction of maternal and neonatal morbidity and mortality related there to.” This should be: “We attempted to determine the epidemiological aspect of cesarean section (CS) performed in adolescent girls at Neisu Rural Hospital, DR Congo, and maternal and neonatal prognosis, whereby to contribute to the reduction of maternal and neonatal morbidity and mortality” Use CS throughout the manuscript to save/reduce spaces.</li><li>2. Define “adolescent pregnancy”. You defined early pregnancy but not adolescent pregnancy. You later defined it in line 64-66. But, define it earlier.</li><li>3. Line 48: “disproportion cerebrospinal -pelvienne (which is often the indication of caesarean section)”; what do you mean? Is this cephalo-pelvic disproportion, which is abbreviated as CPD and a very well-known terminology.</li><li>4. Line 80: “number of antenatal control (ANC)”: what is this? Do you mean “antenatal care” or “antenatal check-ups”?</li><li>5. Line 93: Delete “In fact, the average age of these cesarean section operations was <math>17.50 \pm 1.2</math> years (range: 13 to 19 years)”. Your study population is “this” and no need to say it here, which is very peculiar.</li><li>6. Table 1: All are Christian and thus delete this from this table.</li><li>7. Line 101: “75.5% of elderly teenagers vs 91.7% of adolescent girls.”: One cannot understand the difference between the two. 13-15 is adolescent, isn't it? In this stage simply state the two group 13-15 vs. 16-19. Delete the word of teenager or adolescent hereafter. This causes confusion. This holds true all throughout the manuscript hereafter.</li><li>8. Line 108: Nobody “admitted spontaneously.”. I have never heard of “spontaneous admission”. Almost everybody usually is admitted intentionally and not spontaneously. 69.3% were admitted without transfer??</li><li>9. Line 130: Grave mistake: “Neonatal mortality was 43.9% (5/114).” Make it correct.</li><li>10. Line 134; Grave mistake: “Maternal mortality accounted for 8.8 % (1/114)”. Make it correct.</li><li>11. Line 139: Grave mistake: “This prevalence is superior to many series in the literature.”. Superior means better, but your data indicates opposite. Simply state “higher”.</li><li>12. Line 153: “With regard to socio-demographic characteristics, the age of our respondents ranged from 13 to 19 years with an average age of <math>17.50 \pm 1.2</math> years.” Delete this. You “intentionally” selected this population.</li><li>13. Line 179: “fetopelvic disproportion (69%), acute fetal distress (35.1%), shrunken pelvis (21.9%),”: Usually CPD includes small pelvis (contracted pelvis). What is the difference between the two? Define them.</li></ol> <p>Discussion section is too long and please make it concise. English adviser should revise the manuscript extensively. Not an item-by-item modification but overall edition is necessary. The data is worthy.</p> <p>The data is worthy. Extensive edition is needed. The author uses French word processing and thus impossible spellcheck.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Optional/General</b> comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Shigeki Matsubara</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Jichi Medical University, Japan</i></b>