



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJRRGY_49911</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Dysmenorrhea and associated risk factors among adolescent girls in Junior High School of Upper East region, Ghana</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lines mentioned in results (in abstract) starting from risk factors for dysmenorrhea needs to be modified.  Suggestion- Factors that were identified as predictors of risk factors for dysmenorrhea were; menarche between the age 9-11years (aOR = 1.92, 95% CI = 1.053-3.495), short (&lt;21 days) menstrual cyclic length (aOR = 1.98, 95% CI = 1.021-3.578) and short (&lt;2 days) menstruation days (aOR = 2.55, 95% CI = 1.385-4.617).</li> <li>References are not in a proper format. Which format has been followed? They are not in the format as specified on this journal website.</li> <li>In figure 1 word dysmenorrheics have been used. Please add a reference for this.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lines 25-31 (introduction) have been repeated in discussion too. In introduction it can be rewritten and summarized in 2 lines only.</li> <li>Lines 91- 103  Variables included in Development of questionnaire can be mentioned before pretesting of questionnaire.  Case definition and details about likert scale has been given in last too. May be omitted from one place. It should be written in starting of methodology.</li> <li>Total number (n) should be mentioned on top of every column in all tables.</li> <li>Strengths, limitations should be mentioned separately ( remove from discussion)</li> <li>Recommendations should be given separately (separate out from conclusion)</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objectives may be specified hence making aim more crisp.</li> <li>Basic details should be mentioned before risk factor analysis. e.g. figure 3 should come before table 2.</li> </ol>	



**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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> <p>It is mentioned ethical clearance has been taken. No mention of written informed consent from study subject.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Alka</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education &amp; Research, India</i></b>