

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRGY_129685
Title of the Manuscript:	A study to assess the knowledge regarding menstrual hygiene among the adolescent girls in selected secondary and higher secondary schools of Nadiad city
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The manuscript is imperative to understand the status and conception around menstruation in the mentioned population.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the title is informative and conveying the intention of the study.	
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.	The abstract is beyond 300 words, kindly ask authors to limit it under it.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Though the application of chi-square is fare but I will suggest instead of chi-square the author should seek Spearman's correlation coefficient.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not sufficient and I asked the authors to do advance search in Scopus and other data bases to support their claims.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Though language is good , but there is an abrupt jump from one sentence to other and there is no connection in paragraphs of the introduction. There should be a flow like a story which is missing. Introduction needs to be rewritten again so as discussion to be written as per the result supporting or neglecting the present results and positing personal insights along with the results in the discussion will be helpful.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abhijit Pathak
Department, University & Country	MIT World Peace University, India