

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_82959
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Breastfeeding and its practice at Sabrata area – Libya.
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:

(<https://www.journalajpcb.com/index.php/AJPCB/editorial-policy> )

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Introduction:</b> References need to be mentioned when definitions and numerical data are presented to ensure credibility of information.</p> <p><b>'Objectives'</b> mentioned in the abstract &amp; the study and <b>'Purpose of Study'</b> mentioned in the introduction do not match.</p> <p>Objectives can be put together in a better way considering the data analysed &amp; presented in results.</p> <p><b>Table2:</b> feeding obstacles that faced mothers in the first 24 hours. – Numbers should be provided along with the percentages.</p> <p><b>Table3:</b> Sources of breastfeeding knowledge. – some percentage calculations are incorrect (Social media)</p> <p>Data expressed in Graphs should also be expressed as table, to give better overview to the readers.</p>	Corrected as per suggestion
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Authors can strengthen their paper by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Abstract can be structured better.</li><li>2. Grammatical errors need to be corrected.</li></ol> <p>Technical standards of the methods used by the authors are sound. Data is well controlled and robust. Relevant and current references have been provided during discussion. Some revisions can help strengthening the paper and help convey the message authors have intended to in a more effective way.</p>	Corrected as per suggestion
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	