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Dear Sir,

Report of my review of the manuscript [BMWH-D-16-00254]

I thank you for asking me to review this manuscript entitled "Assessment of Women's Attitude to and Perception of Transvaginal Sonography (TVS) in Nigeria". Authors of this manuscript made attempt to present results of their research findings on TVS, a radiological procedure that is fast gaining ground in obstetrics and gynaecological clinical practice in Nigeria and other developing countries. According to their main objective, they wanted to investigate attitude and perception of women of "mixed educational status" toward TVS use which they hope could potentially increase the existing body of evidence available in Nigeria. Other secondary objectives were; factors that may prevent or discourage women from accepting TVS, and also to assess women's experience of pain during TVS.

These are my comments following my review:

1. General comments: The manuscript was poorly written with many grammatical and punctuation errors. It was very difficult to appreciate the rationale for this study as authors failed to clearly present justifications for the study. I am at a loss as to what information they want to present based on educational status.
2. Specific comments: My specific comments are as follows;

i. Title of the manuscript: Since the study was conducted only in one of the 6 geopolitical zones in Nigeria, I suggest they include their study location into the title.

ii. Abstract: This is confusing to me and the current state fails to summarise the expected key findings. Results on association between educational status and attitude and perception towards TVS were not presented (This was the main objective of the paper), yet authors concluded that "majority of our respondents had positive attitude……."! I am at a loss on what constitute positive attitude here! I suggest that this section should be rewritten to match the core objective of the study. It may be important to include sampling of study settings (how were the hospitals selected?) and study populations (Please provide details of sample size by facility).

iii. Background: There are several statements that need to be edited. For example….Line 7 -“it is ideal for the assessment of ovulation?" Is there any reference for this statement??? Authors need to improve on the literature review by including other studies conducted in Nigeria. The assertion on line 24 & 25 that most studies conducted in Nigeria were mostly on literate might not be entirely correct! May be you meant most studies had more literate than illiterate.

iv. Methods: This section did not provide details on how health facilities and sub-population were selected. It is also unclear as to whether authors used convenience or random sampling. How was the sample size determined for the entire study and by study sites??? What sort of consent (verbal or written) was obtained? It is confusing to me as to how selected experts validated the tools. It would also be nice to have a template of the data collection form. There were no information on how data was analysed to address each of the key objectives. For instance, what is the primary outcome here and what is or are secondary outcome(s)? I suggest that authors should seek help of a statistician to be able to justifiably analyse their data and comprehensibly address each of the study objectives.

v. Results: This section needs to be rewritten! There are were so many tables that could be merge. I suggest you have a detailed descriptive table - sociodemographics. Another should be on test of association. I don't think the figure is necessary. It is better used for scientific presentation.

vi. Discussion - This has to be rewritten as current arguments did not align with objectives of the study. Clear limitations of the study should also be discussed including possible sources of bias.
Conclusion: I cannot recommend this manuscript for publication as it require MAJOR CORRECTIONS

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Imran Morhason-Bello, MSc, MPH, FICS, FMCOG, FWACS
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