

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_130562
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF GENITAL CHLAMYDIA TRACHOMATIS INFECTION IN WOMEN PRESENTING WITH INFERTILITY IN LAGOS, NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant to the scientific community as it addresses the rising global burden of infertility, with an increasing number of couples struggling to conceive. The study highlights the challenges doctors face in diagnosing Chlamydia trachomatis infections, particularly distinguishing active infection from past exposure. Nucleic acid amplification tests (NAAT)—a gold-standards method—provide more accurate data than traditional serology methods, which often mislead clinicians. These findings are critical for improving diagnostic strategies and helping reduce infertility rates in settings with limited resources.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The original title, "Impact of Genital Chlamydia Trachomatis Infection in Women Presenting with Infertility in Lagos, Nigeria," is not fully suitable because the study found no statistically significant association between active Chlamydia trachomatis infection and infertility ($p=0.057$). The term "impact" implies a causative or influential relationship, which the results do not conclusively support. Suggested Alternative Title: "Prevalence of Genital Chlamydia Trachomatis Infection in Women with Infertility in Lagos, Nigeria"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is mostly comprehensive but could be refined for clarity, precision, and alignment with the study's findings. Below are suggestions for improvement: Suggestions for Deletion/Simplification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remove redundant details (e.g., "Data analysis was performed using EPI-INFO version 7.2"), unless the software is critical to the methodology. - Avoid jargon like "third decade of life"; replace with plain language (e.g., "women in their 20s"). 	
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound in its methodology and conclusions, but there are minor limitations and areas for improvement to enhance clarity and rigour. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The cross-sectional design cannot establish causality between C. trachomatis and infertility. While the title uses "impact," the results only describe prevalence differences. Recommendation: Revise the title. - The manuscript reports higher C. trachomatis positivity in women aged 20–29 ($p=0.008$) but does not clarify whether this is a confounder (e.g., younger women may have higher sexual activity). - Revision: Discuss potential reasons for this age trend. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are largely sufficient and include recent studies (up to 2024).	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is publishable with minor revisions to enhance clarity, grammar, and consistency. While the current language is sufficient to convey the study's findings, polishing it will ensure the work is accessible to a global audience and meets the high standards of peer-reviewed journals.	
Optional/General comments	This study makes a meaningful contribution to understanding <i>C. trachomatis</i> in Nigerian infertility cases, particularly by advocating for NAAT over serology. By addressing the above points, the manuscript will achieve greater clarity, relevance, and impact for both scientific and public health audiences. The study complies with fundamental ethical standards, including IRB approval, informed consent, and participant anonymity. This manuscript shows no signs of plagiarism.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vladyslav Berestovyi
Department, University & Country	Bogomolets National Medical University, Ukraine