Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJRRGY_110245**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) serological status unknown at the time of delivery at the University Teaching Hospital of Bogodogo (UTH-B) in Ouagadougou: evaluation of patient's adherence to screening**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

Review Form 1.7

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 **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. The manuscript is well written and is scientifically good. I strongly feel the study is important especially within their scientific community. 2. The title is appropriate reflecting the Aim of the study. However, i suggest the authors to incorporate the study design in the title. Eg: **Evaluation of Patient's adherence to screening of Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) serological status unknown at the time of delivery at the University Teaching Hospital of Bogodogo (UTH-B) in Ouagadougou: A prospective, cross-sectional, descriptive and analytical study.** **3.** The abstract of the article was comprehensively written and is well within the guidelines. There was typographical error in the Results (4th line, The women had had- was written twice). Also, I suggest to incorporate Adherence, serostatus and parturients as keywords the name of the hospital or study site is not suggested as a keyword. I suggest the below order: (limit to 6-7 keywords) Eg: Parturients, HIV, serostatus, adherence, Mother-to-child, transmission, prevention 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate . I suggest the authors to change the subsection #2. Patients and Methods to **Patient Anthropometrics and Study Methodology.** • The numbering of the references used started with reference number 6 in the Introduction which usually starts with reference number 1. Please review and change the numbering accordingly. • Discussion is made w.r.t only one aspect i.e., frequency of patients with unknown HIV serostatus. Suggested to discuss all the results in comparison with the past studies and how do they deviate from the current study findings. 5. The manuscript is found to be scientifically good with all the necessary subsection including methods, results and discussion but there are few concerns: • In the Methodology the authors did not mention the study criteria (Inclusion and exclusion criteria) which is very important for a clinical study. 6. The references used in the manuscript are bare minimum (only 7 references were used) and not recent (All are 12 years old dating back to 2011 and 2012). Suggest to use the references which are recent and not older than 5years.	
Minor REVISION comments	The English language used is good and the quality of it us suitable for scholarly communications	

Review Form 1.7

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	with some typographical and grammatical mistakes.	
Optional/General comments	• Suggest to review the study for grammatical and typographical errors using Grammarly or similar software. • References used were not arranged in an order. Suggest to arrange them in the order of their appearance in the manuscript. • Suggest the authors to mention details related to Conflicts of interest (if any), whether the study is funded by any institute/organization or not or it is self-funded and acknowledgements (if any).	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**K. S. Arun Kumar**
Department, University & Country	**Andhra University, India**