

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_130016
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>IMPACT OF COMBINED ORAL CONTRACEPTIVE PILLS ON CD4 COUNT, OSMOTIC FRAGILITY, TOTAL AND DIFFERENTIAL WHITE BLOOD CELLS OF USERS IN ANTENATAL CLINIC IN PORT HARCOURT</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript highlights the potential immunosuppressive effects of combined oral contraceptives, particularly those with high estrogen content, on critical immune parameters like CD4 count and white blood cell composition. It is important for informing healthcare professionals and women about the possible risks of oral contraceptive use, especially in relation to immune function. The findings may guide recommendations for safer contraceptive options, potentially influencing public health policies and personal healthcare decisions.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title "Impact of Combined Oral Contraceptive Pills on CD4 Count, Osmotic Fragility, Total and Differential White Blood Cells of Users in Antenatal Clinic in Port Harcourt" is mostly appropriate but could benefit from clarification. The focus of the study is on the immune system effects (e.g., CD4 count, white blood cells) in women using combined oral contraceptives, not specifically linked to antenatal care. The mention of "antenatal clinic" might not fully reflect the broader study population or aims.	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract provides a clear overview of the study's aims, methodology, and key findings, making it comprehensive. It succinctly describes the research design, population, and statistical analysis methods used. However, it could benefit from a more detailed explanation of the specific white blood cell parameters examined and their clinical significance.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript appears scientifically sound, as it clearly outlines the methodology, including data collection, statistical analysis, and the specific immune parameters examined. The results are logically presented, with appropriate references to existing literature that support the findings of immune suppression in women using combined oral contraceptives. However, the manuscript could benefit from further discussion of potential confounding factors and a more detailed exploration of the mechanisms underlying the observed immune changes.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references used in the manuscript are old as they are from 1983 till 2012 . This is 2025 years & much research & innovations in medicine is already done . hence these are old references being made in the article.	

### Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The manuscript effectively investigates an important area of health, focusing on the immunological effects of combined oral contraceptives. However, the study could benefit from a more robust discussion on the clinical implications of the findings, particularly regarding long-term health risks for contraceptive users.</li><li>- While the study provides valuable insights, it lacks a detailed explanation of potential confounding variables or limitations, such as the participants' underlying health conditions, which could impact the generalizability of the results. A clearer understanding of these factors would strengthen the manuscript's overall conclusions.</li></ul>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Mridula Pandey</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>