

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-59416

Title: Utility of the Robson Ten-Group Classification System in Categorising Maternal and Neonatal Outcomes at a Tertiary Care Centre: A Prospective Observational Study.

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 obstetric care issue
- Uses a prospective observational study design
- Includes a relatively large sample of 690 women
- Applies the standard Robson classification system
- Covers both maternal and neonatal outcomes
- Uses clearly described eligibility criteria
- Reports institutional ethics committee approval
- Includes statistical comparisons between Robson groups
- Identifies groups contributing substantially to caesarean deliveries
- Provides practical recommendations for improving obstetric care

Weakness of the study:

- Caesarean section indications are not described in detail
- The study is limited to one tertiary centre
- Long term maternal and neonatal outcomes are unavailable
- Some neonatal totals differ across sections
- The number of neonates is inconsistent between results and tables
- Maternal morbidity measures are limited
- Potential confounding factors are not adequately analysed
- Some conclusions may be stronger than the findings support
- Reference formatting requires correction

Reviewers Comments:

This study examines the usefulness of the Robson Ten Group Classification System for assessing caesarean section rates and maternal and neonatal outcomes. The prospective design, relatively large sample and standardised classification method are important strengths. Institutional ethics committee approval and written informed consent are reported, although the approval reference should be added. Major revision is recommended because some numerical inconsistencies need clarification. The results mention 705 neonates, whereas Table 2 reports 704, and the authors should verify the final dataset and all related percentages. The study also lacks detailed information on caesarean section indications and does not adequately account for maternal comorbidities or other confounding factors. Its single centre design limits generalisability, and long term outcomes were not assessed. The authors should avoid interpreting associations as causal relationships. The manuscript is generally understandable but needs editing for grammar, spacing, terminology and reference formatting. Overall, the study has practical value, but the data require careful verification before publication.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript addresses a well studied topic, and many studies have applied the Robson classification to caesarean section rates and birth outcomes. An exact title search alone cannot establish originality or exclude text overlap. The authors should ensure that the methods, results and discussion are original and appropriately cited. A formal similarity check is recommended before publication.