

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_110319
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Insecurity on Access to Maternal Health Services by Women of Reproductive Age in Selected Rural Communities in Zamfara State, Nigeria.
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<b>Yes,</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Need modification</b>    <b>Need modification</b>    <b>Need recent data</b>	Agreed
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	  ➤ Minor English corrections have to be carried out throughout the paper	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	  ➤ The manuscript focuses on concurrent issues    ➤ The introduction part lacks conceptual frame work   ➤ In the sub sections yellow colour indicated by the reviewer reveals that it needs language correction/ space/ ➤ Red colour indicates need of recent data  ➤ In pg.no.04, 2nd para ,5th line that starts with by 1498% while the number of deaths increased by around 196% between what does it indicate ? Number or percentage.  ➤ The words/content in the theoretical framework has to be reworked by the author as it looks inappropriate. In materials and methods the author indicates the mixed method approach but the questionnaire method has been adopted with the support of KII, other method of collecting data has to be included in the article.  ➤ In materials and methods the author indicated that study consisted of 400 women between	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>the ages of 15 and 35years, but in the table 1, it includes the age below 15 and 36-39 (20%), the author has to clarify on it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ The interpretation of the tables should be concise</li><li>➤ In the interpretation of the tables number should be round off eg. 68% instead of 67.6%</li><li>➤ There is no uniformity in the table</li><li>➤ In 4th page the last para that starts data Data on cases of abduction ..... how far it is related to the study as it focus on abduction.</li></ul> <p><b>References are sufficient, but there are some old references which should be replaced by recent studies.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ It is appreciable that the author has chosen the current issues and his/her focus area/methodology is also in scientific method but else there need some modification.</li></ul>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	We agree with the reviewer's observation