



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13800
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Janani Suraksha Yojana (JSY) in Maharashtra, India: Important lessons for implementation
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The title and objectives do not match. In the title authors have reported 'evaluation', but none of the objective relates to evaluation. 2. Authors have not clearly stated Research Question of the study and what hypothesis they were testing? 3. JSY was an important component of flagship program – NRHM, which is now expanded in scope to include neonatal component. The study has used program data (2010) which is now outdated. 4. The papers lacks scientific rigor in study design, sampling and data analysis. In addition, what measures were taken for ensuring data quality. This is important as more than one agency participated in data collection with their own teams of data collectors. 5. The sample selection methods are not clear. The authors claim random selection; did they create sample frame through listing and enumeration? 6. Authors are not clear and specific about what they wanted to evaluate? What are the outcome variables and independent variables? 7. The authors have not addressed the issues of bias and confounding in data analysis. In fact, no attempt has been made for controlling for the effect confounding factors. 8. Construction and format of tables in not uniform and not as per the established norms. 9. Table 1 is redundant. However, the numbers of	1. The study relates to evaluation of the functioning of JSY in Maharashtra. The objectives capture the individual components of the broader evaluation. Now broader objective is mentioned as to evaluate JSY in Maharashtra State. 2. The main research question was: How is the JSY functioning in the state of Maharashtra? Further: If it is not functioning well, what could be the reasons? The hypothesis, or rather the assumption was that there could be variability in the implementation of the scheme across the state for various reasons. However now at the end of introduction research question and hypothesis are stated. 3. Delay in analysis has been mentioned as a limitation. We believe that learning regarding the scheme implementation and what is working and what is not is still relevant in the absence of any study of this kind and of such magnitude. 4. The cross-sectional study design was appropriate for the type of evaluation. Stratified random sampling technique was used to capture the variations according to geographic location of the beneficiaries. The nodal officer of the concerned institution was required to initiate the survey under his/her personal supervision and check at least 5% of the forms for their completeness. Now it is mentioned in material and methods. 5. Listing and enumeration technique was not followed as this was not feasible on account of unavailability of data regarding all eligible women. Some details are mentioned in material and methods.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	eligible women suggest selection bias in various districts. The authors have narrated everything about the table 1, but did not highlight important factors. 10. Table 2: Requires reformatting. How have they used this information in evaluation? 11. Table 2 and Table 3 provide same information? Remove duplication. 12. Table 4: Requires reformatting. Authors have many observations which are more subjective rather than the available data. 13. Table 5, like other tables, show two columns but title says awareness among eligible women. But then also show JSY beneficiary. 14. Reformat table 6. 15. Reformat table 7. Improve title. What does this show? 16. Table 8 is redundant to the objectives of 'evaluation'. The paper lacks scientific rigor. The data analysis is not in line with the objectives. Issues of bias and confounding have not been addressed. Authors should take help of statistician. The authors should also get the manuscript edited for English grammar and language. The manuscript is not appropriate for publication in the present form.	6. The attempt of the evaluation was to understand the effect of various variables on the utilisation of JSY by the eligible women. Accordingly, several factors related to the qualification criteria of JSY, viz. economic status, caste, parity, etc. as well as other factors which would seem to influence the uptake of the scheme were included in the study. Receipt of benefits was dependent variable and rest all variable were considered independent. 7. The selection bias has been minimised through systematic random sampling. Interviewer's bias has been reduced through training and supervision. Respondent and memory bias are likely to be minimal considering the nature of questions and the reference period. All the potential factors that would seem to influence the uptake of the scheme were included in the study. The status of these factors has been analysed using univariate analysis and has been presented in the tables. In fact it is one cohort of women delivered in 2008-2009 and eligible for JSY. Which means it was a homogenous group of all eligible women. Their place of residence, age, economic status, cast, parity etc. was similar and the only difference between two groups was actual receipt of benefits. 8. Formats of table have been changed. Interpretation of the table has been given in the discussion section. 9. Table 1 gives district wise variation about eligible beneficiaries. Excepting table 1 all other information is compiled one, hence it may be continued. Few additional lines are included now. 10. There seems to be a problem in interpretation because of the presentation of data in the tables. E.g. in table 2 it is now made clear that column 6 is a subset of Column 4 and column 8 is subset of column 6. The column heading have been changed now.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		11. Title of tables 2 gives basic information of all women delivered in the year whereas table 3 gives further details of eligible women only. 12. Table 4 gives factual information and not subjective. 13. Table title changed. 14. Table 6 format changed. 15. Table 7 encapsulates the problems faced by the women in availing the JSY benefits that are their due. Addressing these issues is crucial to ensure successful implementation of the scheme. The table is re-titled. 16. Table 8 follows from Table 7, in that it describes what actions are taken, some of which being hardly legal, by the beneficiaries to avail their due benefits. It can hardly be considered redundant.
Minor REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		