



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57306

Title: A Study of Prevalence and Sociodemographic Determinants for Low Birth Weight, Hospital Based Cross-Sectional Study in, Maharashtra India.

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			✓	
Techn. Quality				✓
Clarity				✓
Significance		✓		

Reviewer's ID: JPR-198

Detailed Reviewer's Report

This study investigates the prevalence and sociodemographic determinants of low birth weight (LBW) in a hospital-based setting. The topic is relevant and important for public health, especially in developing regions. However, the manuscript requires major revision due to significant issues in language, methodology clarity, and data interpretation.

Major Comments

1. **Language and Presentation**

The manuscript has extensive grammatical errors, poor sentence structure, and repetition. This seriously affects readability and scientific clarity. Thorough language editing is essential.

2. **Methodology Issues**

The study design is not clearly described. There is inconsistency in study duration (stated Jan 2024–Dec 2025 but described as one year). Sampling method (purposive) is weak and not justified. Inclusion and exclusion criteria are poorly defined.

3. **Statistical Analysis**

The analysis is basic and insufficient. Only chi-square tests are used without controlling for confounders. No multivariate analysis is performed despite multiple variables. Reporting of p-values and test results is inconsistent and sometimes unclear (seen in Tables on pages 6–8).

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. Results Presentation

Tables (pages 4–8) are cluttered, contain formatting errors, and are difficult to interpret. Some percentages and totals appear inconsistent. The narrative repeats table data without adding interpretation.

5. Discussion Quality

The discussion is weak and largely descriptive. It lacks critical comparison with existing literature. The statement that “no similar studies exist” is incorrect and contradicts cited references.

6. Interpretation and Conclusions

The conclusions are too general and not strongly supported by analysis. Important determinants are identified but not critically explained.

Minor Comments

1. Multiple typographical errors and inconsistent terminology (e.g., “statical,” “determinates,” “Keyword”).
2. Repetition of definitions and background information.
3. References are inconsistently formatted and contain duplication.
4. Ethical approval statement is unclear and incomplete.
5. Units and formatting (e.g., percentages, spacing) need correction.
6. Some sentences are incomplete or unclear in Results and Discussion sections.