



### REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57574

**Title:** A descriptive study to assess the level of knowledge regarding polycystic ovarian disease among adolescent girls in Government inter college of Dehradun , Uttarakhand

**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 descriptive study assesses PCOD knowledge among adolescent girls in a single Indian government college. The topic is relevant, but the manuscript has significant methodological and presentation flaws.

The study addresses an important topic, but the manuscript is **incomplete** by basic research reporting standards. Without sample size, demographic data, quantitative results, and references, this paper is not publishable in its current form.

**Recommendation:** Major revision or reject with invitation to resubmit after addressing all methodological reporting gaps.

#### Major Concerns

1. **No sample size mentioned** – Critical missing information. How many participants? Cannot assess study adequacy.
2. **Sampling bias acknowledged but not addressed** – Convenience sampling from one college severely limits generalizability. This is a fatal flaw for a descriptive study claiming to assess knowledge levels.
3. **No demographic data presented** – Age distribution, class/grade, socioeconomic status are absent.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. **Questionnaire not described** – Number of items, scoring system, validity, reliability (Cronbach's alpha) – all missing.
5. **Results lack quantitative data** – Percentages, means, standard deviations, or any statistical presentation are absent. "Majority" and "small percentage" are vague.
6. **No tables or figures** – Essential for descriptive studies.
7. **References missing entirely** – No citation list at the end.

### Minor Concerns

1. Opening with a motivational quote (line 6) is inappropriate for a research manuscript.
2. The "Need for the Study" section (page 2-3) is excessively long and reads like a textbook, not a research justification.
3. Multiple formatting issues – line numbers appear in text, inconsistent spacing.
4. Duplicative content between introduction, need for study, and discussion.
5. No mention of ethical approval or informed consent.

### Specific Missing Elements

- Keywords
- Sample size and justification
- Participant demographics
- Questionnaire details (items, scoring, validation)
- Quantitative results with percentages
- Statistical analysis methods
- Ethics statement
- Reference list
- Tables/graphs for findings