

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_109868
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF WORK-RELATED STRESS AND ITS ASSOCIATED FACTORS AMONG NURSING STAFF IN KING ABDALLAH COMPLEX AT JEDDAH CITY
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, very important. Given the demanding nature of the healthcare industry, especially for nurses, understanding and addressing work-related stress is crucial. The manuscript addresses a significant issue—work-related stress among nursing staff in a healthcare setting. Understanding and mitigating such stress is crucial for both the well-being of healthcare professionals and the quality of patient care. Therefore, it holds importance for the scientific community. 2. The title is generally suitable, as it reflects the focus of the manuscript. However, you may consider making it more concise by rephrasing it, for example, "Prevalence and Factors of Work-Related Stress among Nursing Staff at King Abdullah Complex, Jeddah." 3. The abstract provides a clear overview of the study, addressing the aim, methods, results, and conclusion. Although it effectively communicates the essential elements of the research it has so many grammatical and spelling errors that need to be worked on 4. The manuscript covers essential components of a research paper. It would be prudent to check for any specific guidelines or requirements from the Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International. Also consider adding a literature review as a separate chapter for a more comprehensive structure. 5. The study is scientifically sound, it employs a cross-sectional design and using a validated questionnaire and the results and conclusions are supported by the data presented. The results are presented clearly, and statistical analysis is used to draw conclusions. However, a more detailed explanation of the statistical tests used in the analysis could enhance the manuscript's scientific rigor. 6. The references are spot on, relevant and cover a range of studies on work-related stress among healthcare professionals. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes it is. The manuscript communicates scholarly content effectively, but some improvements in grammar and typos could enhance clarity.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p><u>Suggestions for Improvement:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Language Clarity: Some sentences could be refined for clarity and conciseness. Review the manuscript for grammatical and typographical errors to enhance language quality. 2. Discussion Depth: While the discussion provides a good overview, consider expanding on certain points. For instance, explore the potential implications of the study findings on nursing practice and propose recommendations for addressing work-related stress. 3. Statistical Details: In the results section, include statistical details (e.g., standard deviations) for the demographic characteristics to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the data. <p>The manuscript is well-structured and informative. The suggested improvements are meant to help you enhance clarity and provide a more in-depth discussion</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Sichangwa Andrew
Department, University & Country	School of Public Health, University of Africa, Zambia