



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_50502
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge, Uptake and Barriers to Pap Smear Test among Female Workers in the Rivers State University Teaching Hospital, Nigeria
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 research is well designed and has reliable information that would assist development of intervention strategies in the place of research.</p> <p>Abstract: See comments in text.</p> <p>Introduction: Well reviewed. It would be good to state the pap smear practice in the place of research so as to reflect on the findings (frequency of pap smear, information about if there is an existing health guidelines).</p> <p>The objective is clear.</p> <p>Methods: This is a cross sectional study – the sample is heterogenous, both health and non-health related subjects are included , if a difference is to be statistically determined , sample calculation need to show this. This will also help when data is analysed and commented on.</p> <p>Recruitment of subjects: elaborate on how they are recruited-any bias The aim would be to develop intervention strategies using the results derived. Kindly include Inclusion and Exclusion criteria - perhaps we will exclude those who have not engaged in sexual practices.</p> <p>Results: Tables and figures are well illustrated.</p> <p>Discussion. The general discussion is well written. The concluding paragraphs should have some valuable comments based on the findings- refer to Fig. 4 and reflect on how information provision and practice can be influenced.</p> <p>References: well formatted and written- comprehensive</p>	<p>See additions to introduction.</p> <p>A statement on the limitations of the study has been added at the end of discussion.</p> <p>See amendments made to the methodology.</p> <p>A valuable comment based on finding was made in the conclusion. Fig 4 – see addition to discussion.</p> <p>Many thanks for your observations & corrections.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Generally well written. Some revision based on comments could improve the paper.	

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>There is no comment that the paper has been approved by the Ethics Committee. Consent forms need to be signed by subjects.</p>	