

Paper: “Assessing the Relationship between Short Birth-to-Pregnancy Interval and the Maternal and Perinatal Outcomes among Multiparous Women in Northern Ghana”

Submitted: 28 December 2023

Accepted: 30 January 2024

Published: 29 February 2024

Corresponding Author: Gilbert G. Agulu

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n6p153

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Elton Chavurah
Swansea University, United Kingdom

Reviewer 2: Elena Hunt
Laurentian University, Canada

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	
University/Country: Swansea university (United Kingdom)	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 26 january 2024
Manuscript Title: Assessing the relationship between short birth-to-pregnancy interval and the maternal and perinatal outcomes among multiparous women in Northern Ghana	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
CLEAR	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
THERE IS NEED TO INCOPORATE THE SAMPLING TECHNIQUE	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
ERRORS IN THIS DOCUMENT ARE NEGLIGIBLE	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
LACKS SOME NECESSARY DETAIL. REFER TO COMMENTS MADE ON THE MANUSCRIPT THROUGH TRACK CHANGES	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
WELL PUT	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
THIS SECTION IS WEAK, DISJOINTED AND DOES NOT CONSOLIDATE THE EVIDENCE WHICH THIS STUDY HAS GATHERED. IT REQUIRES RECONSTRUCTION. THERE IS NO CLEAR CONCLUSION UNDER THIS SUB-HEADING. THE AUTHORS HAVE DEMONSTRATED A SIGINIFICANT DEPARTURE FROM THE NORM. THIS SECTION MUST BE CONSTRUCTED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF THE 3 STUDY OBJECTIVES	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
THE REFERENCE SECTION IS MIXED UP. MULTIPLE STYLES HAVE BEEN USED. NEEDS REVISION. WHERE POSSIBLE USE ENDNOTE TO RESTRUCTURE THE SECTION	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

YOUR STUDY IS TOO OBVIOUS. IT DOES NOT BRING ANYTHING NEW AROUND THIS DOMAIN OF STUDY. I SUGGEST YOU FRAME YOUR STUDY AROUND MODELS OF BEHAVIOUR CHANGE SUCH AS THE HEALTH BELIEF MODEL (BECKER, 1974). A DISCUSSION OF THE HEALTH BELIEF MODEL PROVIDES AN INCREASED UNDERSTANDING OF PATIENT MOTIVATION AND HELPS INCREASE COMPLIANCE OR ADHERENCE TO HEALTH EDUCATIONAL ADVICE AMONG PATIENTS

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Elena Hunt	
University/Country: Laurentian University, Canada	
Date Manuscript Received: January 23, 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: January 27, 2024
Manuscript Title: Assessing the relationship between short birth-to-pregnancy interval and the maternal and perinatal outcomes among multiparous women in Northern Ghana	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0122-24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Very few problems indicated directly in the text.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Some minor errors indicated in the text.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I commend the authors for the sound method and the clear presentation.

Thank you for the opportunity to review.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: