

Paper: “Examining the Multifaceted Determinants of Antenatal Care Utilization in Ghana Using Structural Equation Modelling”

Submitted: 25 October 2024

Accepted: 12 December 2024

Published: 31 December 2024

Corresponding Author: Napoleon Bellua Sam

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n36p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n36p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Resubmit

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is not clear. It needs modification. I have wrote the comment about the title on the manuscript at the first page. I am maternal field specialist. i know the theories in detail so the title is not clear to understand. This research hasn't any clinical significance and doesn't add any knowledge to the reader.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

This manuscript needs major revision. The ideal flow and the way of language is poor. It has contradictory idea to the title.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

I t has a lot of grammatically error and spelling mistakes. it is Chat GPT language.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

I have wrote the comment on the method parts. it needs major revision. The method has missed very important parts. They wrote carelessly.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

It has errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Poor writing.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Needs revision. There are misplaced references.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Your study needs major revision. because it has so many faults. Please amend it accordingly. you did it carelessly.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is long and therefore risks the understanding of this works' contribution. I would suggest the authors try to provide a concise and capturing title that better reflects the work done in this article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is generally well written. It enhances the aim of the work and clearly represents the methods used and the results achieved by the authors. Yet, the work may benefit from addressing few and most important implications in the abstract. This will enable the reader understand how this work is positioned within the domain and how it supports or extends extant research.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The article presents few grammatical errors that should be corrected before publication. Also, the authors should pay attention to the language used to convey information. Be careful to use concise sentences and explicitly make a point to the logic behind your choices and results. This will improve the understanding of the work.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods used are briefly explained in the methods section. I would suggest the authors pay attention to elaborate on the reasons for choosing purposive sampling, the context of the study and the way the questionnaire was developed and distributed. Please, explicitly state if the questionnaire was self-developed by the authors, or if it was adopted from another study. Also clarify if the questionnaire was self-administered, completed face-to-face or in any other form. This will add transparency to the process.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear. Minor issues regard writing style and typing errors which should be corrected by the authors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion section, is too general and does not make justice to the work carried by the authors. I would suggest that after summarizing the study carried by the authors and the most important empirical findings of the work, the authors address the

study implications for academic communities, practitioners and policymakers. It is important also to address some future studies, while navigating on the limitations of this work. This will enable a better understanding of the originality and contribution of the work to the existing debates in the domain, as well as be a starting point for further research.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference list is appropriate. Yet, the authors should be careful to keep the same style of referencing in the list. In the current version, there is variation in the style used by authors.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The authors have done a good work and addressed an important topic in the context of Ghana. I believe that with some minor revisions, mostly to enhance understanding and readability of their work, the article will be ready for publication and contribute to enrich the debate of maternal care in the study setting. Good luck to the authors!

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Include recommendations at least one

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Need to be improved

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):