



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_47794
Title of the Manuscript:	Measuring the Caesarean Risk Factors in Bangladesh by Using Binary Logistic Regression Model
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The theme dealt here is interesting. I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abstract: You did not describe the most important results: what were the five factors? What is its significance? Please describe them. "isn't" should not be used in scientific paper; it should be "is not", etc.</li> <li>2. Please use "CS" once you defined it. Be consistent.</li> <li>3. Introduction consists of only one paragraph, which is very peculiar. Please divide it into some appropriate paragraphs. You here state the increasing rate of CS and some adverse events accompanying CS. To express it, you write too many things. Reduce it by 1/2. All reader understands the point. Reduce the volume.</li> <li>4. 2.4.1: Is this "specific" to this study. If not, and if it is the ordinary statistics method, shorten this part. Or simply state the statistics used.</li> <li>5. Figure 1: Does orange indicate total number? Then, delete it. It is self-evident. Simplify the figure.</li> <li>6. Figure 2; Delete this figure. Save the space. Only to indicate this %, one figure is not needed at all.</li> <li>7. Figure 4: Delete orange bar.</li> <li>8. Figure 5: I cannot distinguish the bar in Christian and Buddhism. If it indicates graphically zero in this chart, this figure is meaningless. Be reader-friendly. Make appropriate change.</li> <li>9. Your conclusion is unclear. 1) Your context indicates (at least in you Introduction) that increasing CS rate is NOT a good phenomenon, 2) and then rich, educated women is much more likely to receive CS, thus with these fractions increasing the CS rate. Then, your context may be "Higher CS rate in rich educated fraction should be reduced (decreased). Of course, you do not wish to say, "rich educated women should return back to poor non-educated women"! High risk (of CS) women should be well educated: this should be the present conclusion. Make things clear.</li> </ol> <p>I hope that you may take my advice positively.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**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>Shigeki Matsubara</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Jichi Medical University , Japan</b>