

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth</a>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJPCB_98568  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Childbirth Experiences of Women Who Gave Birth during the COVID-19 Pandemic in the Tohoku Region of Japan |
| 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:

(<https://www.journalajpcb.com/index.php/AJPCB/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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) |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript shares a glimpse of mothers' experiences during/post COVID and highlights opportunities for improvement. Researchers may benefit from addressing the topic and approaching the topic for a difference preceptive.</li> <li>2. The title captures elements of the study but does not make it clear that it is a mixed methods study.</li> <li>3. The abstract clearly states the aim, but the design is misleading. Both qualitative and quantitation descriptions were provided.</li> <li>4. Subsections are provided and help organized the manuscript.</li> <li>5. Scientifically the manuscript casts doubt on the authenticity and trustworthiness of the qualitative/free comment findings.</li> <li>6. the references sufficient and all more than 90% are within the past 3 years.</li> </ol>   |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The English is suitable for scholarly communications in the U.S.</li> </ol>   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Re-work the abstract to let the conclusion match the results. The study was not about adequacy of care therefore the author should not say It is necessary to improve the medical care delivery system to provide adequate care by securing personnel and utilizing social network services. The results did not mention the number of personnel therefore securing personnel should not be in the conclusion.</li> <li>2. Although the author states this is a quantitative descriptive study, it appears to be mixed methods study with both quantitative and qualitative results since there were open-ended questions that were coded with themes.</li> <li>3. 1000 letters were sent, and the response rate was &lt;25%. This is a poor response rate for a survey. The method section should also include the survey questions.</li> <li>4. <b>3.2.1</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The comments do not seem to match the yes/no percentage. Although 67% of the women reported COVID-19 did not influence the method and date of medical examinations, the free comment section paints a different picture.</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. <b>3.2.2</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The small percent (21.4%) of women who reported that COVID-19 affected their health guidance during pregnancy does not match the interpretation provided by the author that the following factor were a problem. Where is the data to substantiate this claim?</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. <b>3.2.3</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. By trying to quantify open-ended questions, the author decreases the validity of the study findings. While each of the Covid related restriction may have been a problem for the mother, the summary provided by the author is not supported by direct quotes from the participants.</li> </ol> </li> <li>7. <b>3.2.4</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Four participants received communication about date of their post-delivery visit, hand sanitizer, and consultation. Is this a good or bad thing?</li> </ol> </li> <li>8. <b>3.3.1</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The quotes seem to be negative and the things the women were unhappy about. Were there any positive comments?</li> </ol> </li> <li>9. <b>3.3.3</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Glad there was at least one or two quotes to support the summary provided. But it seems 87.4% reported matters regarding COVID-19-related changes or</li> </ol> </li> </ol> |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>restrictions, but only a few comments. How do you interpret that?</p> <p>10. <b>3.3.4</b><br/>a. Share quotes to support the summary.</p> <p>11. <b>3.4.1</b><br/>a. How are the comments in this section related to “Means of returning home”?</p> <p>12. <b>3.4.5</b><br/>a. Is the summary in this section based on comments from another section?</p> <p>13. <b>3.4.6</b><br/>a. Why provide direct quotes in this section and no summary? Be more consistent.</p> <p>14. <b>3.5</b><br/>a. One or two quotes are provided for each of the six themes; however, these brief statements seem vague and without knowing the exact question posed to the participant, it is impossible to assess the credibility of the themes.</p> <p>15. <b>4.</b><br/>a. Think about using the 3 major themes from the second paragraph in the section to re-write the conclusion in the abstract.</p> <p>16. <b>4.1 ANXIETY</b><br/>a. Loneliness was mentioned a number of times in the comments, but the data does not support anxiety and isolation mentioned in the comment. Be sure the discussion reflects the data.</p> <p>17. <b>4.1 CONCERNS</b><br/>a. The author states that the participants were afraid but did not link fear to anxiety. The author then recommends education/classes so mothers won't be too anxious about infection control..., perhaps this section should be titled fear or anxiety.</p> <p>18. <b>4.2 Social isolation</b><br/>a. It appears the author uses loneliness and isolation interchangeably. While there is a difference between social isolation and isolation, the author should clarify isolation from loneliness.<br/>b. The recommendation to increase staff should be limited since the study focused on patient experience not staffing.</p> <p>19. <b>4.3 Limitations</b><br/>a) What about generalizability? Can the findings of this study be generalized and if not why.</p> <p>20. <b>4. CONCLUSION</b><br/>a. The conclusion needs to match the results. The author states the women <i>demand that nurses provide not only infection control measures...</i>, however there is no mention of this in the comments. Also, the conclusion to <i>improve the medical care delivery system to provide adequate care by securing personnel and utilizing the internet</i>, is unfounded.<br/>b. Going beyond the data may be due to faulty logic or preconceived ideas and allowing personal biases to influence the conclusions. When forming conclusions, it is important to remember that research offers support for a position when the study design and analyses were appropriate.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

**PART 2:**

|  | 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) |
|--|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                      |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Name:                            | Yvonne Wesley        |
| Department, University & Country | Kean University, USA |