



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJRRGY_50322</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>HORMONAL CONTRACEPTIVE UPTAKE AND SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PATTERN OF ACCEPTORS IN A FAMILY PLANNING CLINIC OF A TERTIARY HEALTH FACILITY IN RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA.</b>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The sample size of both the studies is exactly the same</li> <li>2) Both the studies aim at investigating the same research question</li> <li>3) The wordings used are exactly the same at several places</li> <li>4) The demographic characteristics of both the studies, eg: number of married women and number of unmarried women</li> <li>5) Number of people who completed the family vs. Family size not completed is exactly the same</li> <li>6) The results of both the studies in terms of the most popular contraceptive choice is the same</li> </ol> <p>I am of the strong opinion that these observations can't be by chance alone and hence need to be further investigated. Further review is put on hold till the editor opines on this matter and conveys the editorial decision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I think it is pertinent for me to mention that I note this as a case of self plagiarism (just an opinion) because there is a pattern of similar errors which is probably made by the same author or a group of authors from the same place.</li> </ul>	<p>1. This study, like the other one, used data from the same data source, i.e. medical records from the family planning clinic over a one-year period, so little change if any can be seen, even if a different researcher used it and for many years to come; this explains comment 1, 4, 5 and 6.</p> <p>2. I strongly disagree with comment 2; while the previous study looked at the contraceptive choices in general, this one specifically aimed to assess the uptake of hormonal methods only and determinants of that choice.</p> <p>3. comment 3 is correct to the extent of a few (not several) places. The authors of both studies are the same and their words or style can't be largely different. Only one paragraph in the introduction of both studies citing relevant local studies was repeated. The presentation of the results, including tables and figures is quite different.</p> <p>4. This reviewer obviously knows the authors or was preview to the other study to allege self-plagiarism, without taking the above into consideration. This is clear when compared to the other two reviewers. However, both manuscripts were submitted same time and none was trying to copy the other.</p> <p>5. His comments are more of an accusation than a review and quite disrespectful (just an opinion). Luckily the final decision lies with the editors and I will accept whatever it is.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	-	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	