



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_15826
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARISON OF THE ACCURACY OF THE USE OF LAST MENSTRUAL PERIOD AND SYMPHYSEAL FUNDAL HEIGHT FOR GESTATIONAL AGE DETERMINATION AMONG NIGERIAN WOMEN
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This paper is a very naive correlation among US scan , LMP and SFH with the gestational age. Everything is based on an unclear statistical analysis that compares the means of perhaps the gestational age expressed in weeks obtained by LMP and SFH using the US scan as gold standard. Therefore the mean difference (I don't understand the unit of measurement maybe weeks expressed in decimals (1 week = 10 decimals not 7 days ??)) is lower when SFH is compared with LMP at both the times of observation. Major points 1. The BMI and the parity are important covariates that should be included in the SFH measurement 2. The authors use 2 windows of measurements. "first visit after 22 weeks" and "second visit after 22 weeks" but they do not mention the crude mean week and the range. 3. As the authors state, the US scan itself can't be the gold standard of gestational age determination 4. Sounds weird that the accuracy calculation includes 2 weeks of range when the standard deviations expressed in Table 2 are around 1.5 weeks. I should reduce the tolerance	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Minor point 1. Line 169 should report a p-value >0.05 not <0.001	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. Data about the outcome of pregnancy and neonatal weight should be provided 3. A comment about the divergent trend of the mean difference (-0.391 vs 0.388 for LMP and -0.028 vs 0.031) should be included. 4 A comment about the possible best time for gestational age measurement by using SFH should be included	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper itself is useful if the US scan is not available, but the statistics should be reviewed at all. I do suggest the use of a general linear model (GLM) able to analyze the data all at once so to reduce the bias. Student t test does not describe properly the real meaning of the paper.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Italy