



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_49068
Title of the Manuscript:	A survey of contraceptive use and associated factors among street beggar women in South Ethiopia
Type of the Article	? (Original 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>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The introduction is too elaborate in places not coherent with the topic under discussion. - It can be made relevant by describing the usage of contraceptives in the specific population group described, because the introduction is not in line with the title of the study - The objectives can be more clearly emphasised <p>Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Detailed description of all the methods of data collection and analysis is not essential, Please consider revising, specifically the bio-statistical analysis is not absolutely essential 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methods section may be decreased especially line 17, 18 - Conclusion needs to be well written - Line 35 – spelling mistakes - Please check your word limit with the journal's policy as the reference <p>Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 92 – Study design – Please avoid details that are not absolutely essential for the understanding of the study - If the beggar remained anonymous, how was duplication of data prevented as there could have been instances where one beggar could've been interviewed twice <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 174 – Please consider revising and restructuring for sentence structure <p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not be written in italics 	
Optional/General comments	The study has a well established design and methodology, but the word count is too high, Please try and adjust the same.	

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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Mohammed Ismail Khan</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>ESIC Medical College, India</i>