



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-57360

Title: Perception of Adolescents and Young Women Regarding Caesarean Section Deliveries A Cross Sectional Study in District U S Nagar Uttarakhand

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- ✓ Accept after minor revision.....**
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study

- Addresses an important public health issue related to rising caesarean section rates in India
- Focuses on adolescents and young women which is a less explored but important group
- Adequate sample size of 200 participants improves reliability
- Clear presentation of results using tables on pages 3 and 4
- Practical findings useful for planning reproductive health education programs
- Includes multiple influencing factors like family and medical advice

Weakness of the study

- Uses convenience sampling which may introduce selection bias
- Cross sectional design limits causal interpretation of findings
- Data analysis is only descriptive without advanced statistical testing
- Questionnaire validation not clearly described
- Some grammatical and formatting issues present
- Limited depth in discussion and lack of strong analytical interpretation
- Ethical approval statement not clearly mentioned

Reviewers Comments

The manuscript presents a relevant study exploring awareness and perceptions regarding caesarean section among adolescent girls and young women. The topic is important as this group represents future decision makers in maternal health. The study design is simple and appropriate, and the results are clearly presented through tables on pages 3 and 4, showing that most participants had neutral perceptions and limited understanding. However, ethical clearance is not clearly mentioned, which should be addressed. The writing is generally understandable but needs improvement in grammar and sentence structure. The study is limited by the use of convenience sampling and descriptive analysis, which reduces the strength of conclusions. The discussion highlights key findings but could be more analytical and better linked with existing literature. Overall, the study is useful but requires improvement in reporting clarity and methodological detail before publication.