

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRGY_84545
Title of the Manuscript:	INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE AND ASSOCIATED FACTORS AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN, A CROSS SECTIONAL STUDY.
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.journalijrrgy.com/index.php/IJRRGY/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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The introduction part should be improved</li><li>2. There is not a single overarching statement that captures the problem. Besides, the set objectives to address the statement of the problem are missing (Where is the research gap? How did you come to develop this study?)</li><li>3. Why you have chosen this particular hospital (Ekiti State University Teaching Hospital) as the study area? Need to add the reason.</li><li>4. You have to give the reason why have you used cross sectional descriptive study as your study design</li><li>5. The sampling techniques and procedures should be improved (What was the sample size? What was the parameter of selected sample size? and which procedures have you used to select respondents)</li><li>6. The manuscript has no section for literature review.</li><li>7. What is WAST? How does it operate? It is better to highlight its operations prior to its operation</li><li>8. It is not clear. How did you analyze qualitative and quantitative data? You need to be clear on this important research issue</li><li>9. You need to be smart and systematic when pesenting substantial research issues in data analysis part.</li><li>10. How many objectives did you have? Your findings have focused on socio-demographic variables, what about other findings? This issue should be clearly defined from the background information and well covered in the methodology.The findings should accommodate all specific objectives.</li><li>11. Where is the discussion for Table 2</li><li>12. Your conclusion should manifest from the findings. Since the findings are unclear, even the conclusion is not clear.</li><li>13. Try to systematize your work.</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Introduction has been improved on.</li><li>2. This has been incorporated in the last paragraph of the introduction.</li><li>3. The hospital was chosen because it is the major referral centre in the state. The hospital also receives patients from neighbouring states.</li><li>4. A cross sectional descriptive design was used because we tried to determine the point prevalence of IPV without following the patients up for the impact of IPV. Perhaps a longitudinal study could be done in future studies to determine the consequences of IPV.</li><li>5. Consecutive consenting pregnant women who reported at the antenatal clinic were recruited as participants.</li><li>6. Literature review is not included in the guidelines for authors.</li><li>7. We have tried to include further details about WAST under instruments.</li><li>8. There were no qualitative data. The various instruments used elicited quantitative data which were appropriately analysed.</li><li>9. Thank you for the comment.</li><li>10. The findings were not restricted to sociodemographic variables alone.</li><li>11. We did discuss the table while discussing about the common forms of abuse.</li></ol> <p>Sincere appreciation for the comments. The comments have really improved the quality of our paper.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. What is the validity and reliability of quantitative questionnaire?</li><li>2. Recommendations should be clearer and it should be connected with each results</li><li>3. It is suggested to review the list of references, as there are some errors in the format.</li><li>4. Observe sentence case in table 2</li></ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It's important to go through your work several times to ensure all grammatical errors are eliminated.	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	