



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_56594
Title of the Manuscript:	An analysis of the factors that contribute to late booking for focused Antenatal Care (FANC) in Hartcliffe, Zimbabwe
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>To authors,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: "Late booking" should be defined. How about 12, 16, or 20 weeks? FANC should be defined (you used abbreviation without its defining). 2. Introduction is too long. You here should only state that late booking is usually made and the present study attempted the reason/character for/of this phenomenon. If you wish to hold some parts (written in Introduction), then please move them to Discussion. 3. Methods; How many were booked "early". State the percentage of late booking. 270-50=220 were booked early? Figure 1 indicates this? But, FANC and early/late booking may be different concept. Please explain things. 4. If possible, demerit that late-booking actually caused in these 50 women should be written. If you have no data regarding this, please state so. It is sometimes the case that "low-risk women may not visit early." Vice versa, if one has some coexisting disorders (i.e., high risk pregnancy), one may visit early. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shigeki Matsubara
Department, University & Country	Jichi Medical University, Japan