



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_5408
Title of the Manuscript:	Indications for Gynaecological Consultation by Women at a Rural Outreach Centre in North-Central Nigeria
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The most concern of this manuscript is the ethical approval which has been obtained through informal method. It may give negative impact to the journal if this manuscript is accepted for publication. The data should be obtained through the consent of the volunteers and approval granted by the Ethical Committee in accordance to the ICH GCP guideline and the declaration of Helsinki.	The study was not a direct volunteers administered questionnaire and so volunteers were not there for individual consent. Data were collected from the hospital records of the patients attended to during the seven years of outreach visit for gynaecological care. The facility had a secured patients' record room and only authorised persons were allowed entry. Confidentiality of the records/data for the study was maintained through coding. Management of the facility reviewed the study proposal prior to granting the approval.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Grammar mistakes have been noticed throughout the manuscript. Please revise the manuscript thoroughly. 2. In the introduction, please remove the citation 1 since it is a common sentence. 3. In the method and result parts, the standard deviations should be attached. 4. Besides, as mentioned in the method, incomplete data of the patients should not be included. But why the data of patients of no age, no stated in parity distribution were still counted in the study. 5. The number of volunteers involve in this study were confusing and incorrect (n=1605 or 2390). 6. How was the percentage being counted? 7. Please state clearly the meaning of primary, secondary, tertiary and quaternary, readers without gynaecological background will not understand the term. 8. The tables are unorganized; please reconstruct the table with	1. Agree, grammar mistakes were reviewed and corrected as highlighted in the manuscript. 2. Citation 1 in the introduction removed. 3. Comment noted and the standard deviation inserted. 4. The data with no age and parity though incomplete, the reasons for consultation and diagnoses were available hence they were captured and the deficiencies counted as minor. The deficiencies did not form part of the computation of the average for age and parity. 5. The number of women that formed the study population were 1605. 2390 were number of women according to their presenting complaints and about 50% of the women had multiple presenting complaints. 6. The percentages were calculated using



SDI Review Form 1.6

	proper column title. 9. References should be cited in this statement line 417 to support your view.	descriptive statics 7. Comment accepted and the wordings defined. 8. Comment noted and the table adjusted. 9. The statement in line 417 is the authors assertion from the study and not a cited reference
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript entitled "Indications for gynaecological consultation by women at a rural outreach centre in North central Nigeria" described reasons of women who were seeking to gynaecological expert in North central Nigeria. However, it is not warranted publication in this journal due to some of the minor and major concerns as listed above. In addition, this study is the preliminary study of only involving people of North central Nigeria which might not satisfy an interest of the international readers.	The authors are still of the opinion that the manuscript is worth consideration for publication by IJTDH.