

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-54270

Date: 09/10/2025

Title: "Comparing Delayed and Early Cord Clamping: A Systematic Review of Benefits and Risks"

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

Date: 10/10/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication:

This systematic review effectively consolidates current evidence on the benefits of delayed cord clamping, emphasizing its positive effects on neonatal hematological status and cardiovascular stability, with no significant maternal risks identified. The manuscript supports current clinical guidelines recommending DCC in both term and preterm births. However, to strengthen its scientific rigor, the authors should expand on methodological details, address potential biases, and elaborate on long-term neurodevelopmental outcomes. Overall, with minor revisions, this paper could make a valuable contribution to neonatal and obstetric literature.

Reviewer's Comment / Report

Strengths:

- Comprehensive Literature Review:** The paper systematically reviews an extensive range of studies published between 2008 and 2023, providing a current and thorough synthesis of evidence regarding DCC and ECC.
- Clarity of Objectives:** The aims of the study comparing neonatal and maternal outcomes between DCC and ECC are explicitly stated, guiding the reader effectively.
- Balanced Presentation of Benefits and Risks:** The manuscript discusses both positive outcomes associated with DCC, such as improved hemoglobin and iron stores, and potential concerns like neonatal jaundice, supported by references.
- Inclusion of Meta-Analytic Evidence:** The authors utilize high-quality evidence, including systematic reviews and randomized controlled trials, enhancing the credibility of their conclusions.
- Relevant Clinical Implications:** The findings support current guidelines, advocating for DCC, which can influence clinical practices and policy-making.

Weaknesses:

- Limited Detail on Methodology:** The methodology section provides a brief overview of the search strategy but lacks details on study selection criteria, quality assessment tools, and data extraction processes, which are crucial for assessing the robustness of a systematic review.
- Underdeveloped Discussion on Long-term Outcomes:** While immediate neonatal benefits are highlighted, the paper mentions that long-term neurodevelopmental impacts warrant further research but does not elaborate on existing gaps or ongoing studies.
- Inconsistent Use of Abbreviations and Terms:** For example, ECC and DCC are introduced but occasionally not consistently abbreviated throughout or explained upon first use.
- Potential Bias and Limitation Acknowledgment:** The review does not explicitly discuss potential biases in included studies or limitations like heterogeneity among the studies, which are important for balanced interpretation.
- Minor Typographical and Grammatical Errors:**

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- "neonatal outcomes, particularly in enhancing" (Page 10) could be clearer as "especially in enhancing."
- The phrase "blood volume in the neonate" could be rephrased for clarity.
- Inconsistent formatting of references (e.g., "[7]" vs. "[1,6]").

Recommendations for the Authors:

1. **Methodology:** Provide a detailed description of the systematic review process, including inclusion/exclusion criteria, quality assessment methods (e.g., risk of bias tools), and data synthesis strategies.
2. **Discussion Expansion:** Elaborate on the long-term neurodevelopmental outcomes associated with DCC and discuss ongoing research efforts in this area.
3. **Formatting and Language:** Ensure consistent use and explanation of abbreviations. Correct minor typographical and grammatical errors for clarity and professionalism.
4. **Limitations:** Acknowledge potential biases, study heterogeneity, and limitations of the included studies to provide a balanced perspective.