



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_46890
Title of the Manuscript:	OBSTETRIC FISTULA: THE AGONY OF UNSAFE MOTHERHOOD. A REVIEW OF NIGERIA EXPERIENCE
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The theme dealt here is important. I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 40-44: Please confirm if obstetric injury (tear of the lower genital tract) may be also (main) cause of fistula. Your statement sounds as if ischemia necrosis is the sole cause of obstetric fistula. Please confirm this. I mean that even in developed countries we sometimes encounter severe obstetric vaginal injury (vesicovaginal or rectovaginal opening) but we do repair at the time of delivery. If these fractions also constitute fistula should be touched. You state the issue related to this in Line 110 but please make it clearer. Many doctors in developed countries may consider that fistula may occur after obstetric injury and its inadequate (or no) repair. Line 158: Please explain this issue in a more easy expression or in more definite writing. The phrases can read, "of women eventually suffered from fistula in this delivery, 75-92% also suffered stillbirth". This may not be the case. Please write this part in a more reader-friendly manner. References: Ref. 37; please check pages. Some journals are written in full spelling and others in abbreviation. Be consistent. Please copy and paste PubMed instead of writing ones by yourself. Review usually consists of the following: how many literatures were first retrieved? Then how many papers fit your purpose? Then, how did you pick up literatures that were used to write this paper? This is so called systematic review. I do understand that this typical/orthodox method may not fit to this theme. Thus, the present "review" is narrative one. I mean that you did not systematically review the papers but you wrote/reconfirm things based on the existing papers that fit to your thought/concept/idea. In this sense, you picked up literatures "arbitrarily". I never blame you for this. But readers expect "systematic" review when looking at the title. Thus I recommend you that you straightforwardly state that the present paper is the concept/proposal based on the literature, but literature review was not done systematically due to the specificity/uniqueness of this issue. Please describe this meaning very briefly. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shigeki Matsubara
Department, University & Country	Jichi Medical University, Japan