EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute
15 YEARS

Paper: **"The Role of Family and Culture on Young Women's Perceptions of Motherhood: A Comparative Study of Sri Lankan and Indian Female College Students"**

Submitted: 18 August 2025
Accepted: 22 October 2025
Published: 31 October 2025

Corresponding Author: Iresha Lakshman

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n29p76

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Juliana Ajdini
University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Hala Al-Louzi
Istanbul Okan University, Turkey

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025*
This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Hala Al-louzi	
University/Country: Istanbul Okan University/ Turkey	
Date Manuscript Received: 3rd of Oct	Date Review Report Submitted: 8th of Oct
Manuscript Title: Impact of Family and Cultural Upbringing on Young Women's Perception of Motherhood: A Comparative Study among Sri Lankan and Indian Female College Students	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: yes I do	

Evaluation Criteria:
Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
The title is precise, informative, and reflects both the comparative scope and main research focus. Consider minor shortening for conciseness but it is overall strong and relevant.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**4.5**
The abstract effectively summarizes purpose, methods, and findings. Adding one clear concluding sentence on the study's contribution would strengthen it.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
The language is generally clear and fluent, with only minor stylistic issues. A light professional edit can improve flow and sentence rhythm.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4.5

The mixed-method design and sampling strategy are well-described. Clarify the meaning of 'pseudo-longitudinal' and specify the data collection timeframe.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4.5
Results are logically presented and well-supported by data. Consider separating results from interpretive discussion for clarity.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4.5
The conclusions reflect the results accurately and highlight cultural contrasts well. Adding a short 'limitations and future research' section would strengthen the academic completeness.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
References are current, well-selected, and formatted according to academic standards. Sources from South Asian gender studies are well-integrated.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**yes**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript offers a well-structured and theoretically grounded comparative analysis of how young women in Sri Lanka and India perceive motherhood. It provides valuable insight into the intersections of gender, education, and fertility patterns in South Asia and makes a meaningful contribution to current sociological and gender studies research.
A few minor revisions are suggested to further strengthen the paper:

1. Clearly state the main research questions or hypotheses in the introduction to enhance focus and coherence.
2. Specify the time frame of data collection and provide a brief clarification of the term “pseudo-longitudinal” as used in this study.
3. Add a concise paragraph on the study’s limitations and possible directions for future research.
4. Refine some sentences to improve flow and readability, ensuring a smooth academic tone throughout.

With these small adjustments, the paper will be ready for publication.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025*
This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 19/8/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/8/2025
Manuscript Title: Impact of Family and Cultural Upbringing on Young Women's Perception of Motherhood: A Comparative Study among Sri Lankan and Indian Female College Students	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:
Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4/5**
The title is clear and adequately reflects the content. It captures the main aspects (family, culture, motherhood, and comparative study). However, it is slightly long and could be made more concise.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**4/5**
The abstract outlines the objectives, methodology, and findings clearly. However, it is lengthy and dense. A more structured format (problem – methods – findings – implications) would improve clarity.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5/5**
The manuscript is well written, with only minor stylistic issues.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5/5**

The methodology is explained in detail, including mixed-method design and pseudo-longitudinal elements. The sample size is appropriate. Suggestions: clarify the pseudo-longitudinal limitations, describe sampling more explicitly, and provide more detail on qualitative analysis procedures.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5/5**
Results are clearly presented and theoretically well interpreted. Integration of quantitative and qualitative data is a strength.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5/5**
The conclusions are accurate and align with the findings. They highlight cultural differences and the role of education and career aspirations.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5/5**
The references are comprehensive, up-to-date, and relevant. Both classical and recent works are included, formatted correctly, and strengthen the manuscript.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Shorten the title to make it more concise and attractive.
- Restructure the abstract for better clarity (problem – methods – findings – implications).
- Consider adding tables/figures for main results.
- Provide more details on methodological limitations and qualitative analysis procedures.
- Strengthen conclusions with concrete recommendations for gender equality policies.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: