



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_46676
Title of the Manuscript:	Level of knowledge on prematurity and its complications in women seeking care at referral hospitals
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 evaluates the knowledge of complications and risk factors that are associated with prematurity. It is a questionnaire study from a heterogenous group including non-pregnancy women. Although the method employed is acceptable there are some areas that need improvement so as to show that the objectives of the study are met. Many comments are made on the manuscript so as to assist the authors in revision.</p> <p>1. Abstract: This needs to be improved so as to highlight the objectives, method employed and relevant results. What is derived are the knowledge of variables studied ; so these are to be stated. The key words need to be improved .</p> <p>2. Introduction: This is a literature review of prematurity. It can be summarised so as to support the objectives of the study without referring to all the issues relating to prematurity. Some reference must be made to 'knowledge gaps' in mothers of premature babies, so as to justify the study.</p> <p>3. Methods and Materials. This section must be revised extensively so as to describe how the study was done. There is data collection based on questionnaire administered by health professionals to mothers presumably attending clinics and also those who are attending to babies in NICU (and non-pregnant mothers). As the study can be affected by the way such subjects are recruited, we need to describe method of recruitment, any randomization done, time-duration of administration of the questionnaire and completeness of information. Mention must be made how the questions were drawn and if they were validated. The three areas of the questionnaire , I suppose reflects on the knowledge desired to be studied.</p> <p>There is mention of a qualitative component-this should be elaborated in the methodology.</p> <p>Why were non-pregnant women recruited; were they mothers who had delivered premature babies; some statement to this effect should be made.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>The tables are well outlined .</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>This section needs to be improved to reflect on the objectives. This leads to the issue of outlining the research question well from the outset. If the research question were well written the conclusion would be better written. In concluding we need to state the limitations of this study; it appears to employ convenient sampling- which has its own limitations.</p> <p>References.</p> <p>The authors need to be aware of the style to be adopted. This section is not a bibliography but references. The numbering is duplicated and the many references are not written in journal style.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>There is a need for the a review of how many sentences are constructed to show the meaning. It would be good to get an English review done after revision so as to ensure the sentence construct will be in line with the meaning intended to be expressed.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Ethical approval has been obtained from Institute	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sivalingam Nallih
Department, University & Country	International Medical University, Malaysia