Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Current Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARJOCS_1672**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Correlates of Responsiveness and Empathy on Antenatal Patients' Satisfaction in Primary Healthcare Facilities in Obio-Akpor LGA**
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	• This manuscript is useful for readers of the scientific community, and allows the development of inspiration, ideas and innovations based on data obtained accurately. • The results of this study can be used as a source of information and a basis for improving maternal and child health services by involving service providers such as midwives or maternity nurses. • This manuscript conveys an idea that contains data and facts from valid and clear sources in each presentation, compiled with a scientific method and accompanied by a theoretical study, with the hope that the ideas in the article can ultimately educate, convince, and also become the basis for further research development.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	I would recommend a title without the research location, so that it attracts readers to read the entire manuscript. Alternative title: Correlates of Responsiveness and Empathy on Antenatal Patients' Satisfaction in Primary Healthcare Facilities.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Authors are inconsistent in writing abstracts, several points need to be added and corrected, namely: • revision of sampling techniques (mentioned in the abstract: random, while in other sections in the manuscript it is written: combined stratified random sampling and purposive sampling). • Research time needs to be added. • The number of words needs to be checked again, it should not exceed 300 words in length	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate, namely: • The number of words exceeds 6000 words (a length of 3000-6000 words (including everything) • Subsections do not comply with the provisions for writing articles in this journal (it should follow the structure of: Abstract, Introduction, Methodology, Results, and Discussion, Conclusion, Acknowledgements, Competing Interests, Authors' Contributions, Consent (where applicable), Ethical approval (where applicable), and References plus figures and/or tables. • Introduction: needs to be supported by the latest literature (if possible). Is a subsection: Review of Related Literature and Hypothesis Development needed? • Methodology: Research time needs to be added. Population size and estimated sample size and reasons need to be stated. Definitions of important terms and variables need to be stated. State the approval of research subjects and Ethical Clearance, including number of the certificate. • Results: a table of research subject characteristics needs to be included, and the results are synchronized with the hypothesis that has been prepared. • Discussion: the limitations of the research and their impact on the results are discussed.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	• This manuscript conveys an idea that contains data and facts from valid sources • This manuscript is accompanied by a theoretical study. • Respondents involved are relatively many, 264 people	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	Use the latest references and all references must be numbered consecutively and citations of references in text should be identified using numbers in square brackets. Please follow the writing rules.	

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments	Authors need to read the detailed provisions for writing articles in this journal.	

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:	**Sri Wahyuni, M.Mid**
Department, University & Country	**Health Polytechnic of Surakarta, Indoensia**