

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_127833
Title of the Manuscript:	“EFFECTIVENESS OF PRESENCE OF SUPPORT PERSON ON LABOUR OUTCOME AMONG PRIMI-PARTURIENT MOTHERS AT SELECTED HOSPITALS OF NADIAD.”
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Comments**

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript is essential for the scientific community as it addresses a significant gap in maternal health care: the impact of a support person during labor. By focusing on primiparous mothers, the study highlights the potential benefits of labor companionship in improving maternal outcomes, particularly in terms of pain and anxiety management. Such findings contribute to the evidence base for promoting labor companionship as a standard practice, aligning with global efforts to humanize childbirth and uphold women’s rights. The study also provides critical insights for healthcare providers and policymakers to prioritize psychosocial support during labor.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>a possible title suggestion is:</b> "The Impact of Support Persons on Labour Outcomes: A Study Among Primi-parturient Mothers in Nadiad."	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is generally comprehensive, but it could be improved by: 1. Clearly stating the methodology used, including the quasi-experimental design. 2. Providing specific findings (e.g., key outcomes like pain and anxiety levels). 3. Highlighting the practical implications of the results in improving labor outcomes. Suggested revision: Include numerical results or key statistical findings to provide a stronger summary.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript appears scientifically correct, as it uses a clear quasi-experimental design and analyzes associations through appropriate statistical tests like chi-square. However, ensure: The methods section is detailed enough for replication and All statistical tests are appropriately justified, particularly for demographic associations with pain and anxiety levels.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references provided seem relevant but should be evaluated for recency. Consider incorporating more recent literature on labor companionship, particularly studies published within the last five years in high-impact journals.	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality is generally acceptable but could benefit from minor revisions to improve fluency and clarity. Some sentences in the introduction and results sections are overly complex and can be simplified for better readability.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b></p>	<p>The manuscript could benefit from a stronger conclusion that ties findings to actionable recommendations for clinical practice and policy. Consider visual aids like tables or graphs to summarize demographic associations and key outcomes for clarity. Expand the discussion on the implications of findings, particularly in resource-limited settings or diverse cultural contexts. The study is well-designed and addresses an important topic, but minor improvements in structure, language, and reference selection could enhance its impact and readability.</p> <p>Based on this information, there appear to be no ethical concerns. However, the manuscript should clarify: Measures taken to ensure confidentiality and anonymity of participants</p> <p>There is no mention of competing interests in the manuscript. It is advisable for the authors to include a formal <i>Conflict of Interest</i> statement to ensure transparency.</p> <p>No plagiarism concerns are explicitly noted based on the content provided.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b><u>Reviewer's comment</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>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)</u></b></p>
<p><b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p><b>Name:</b></p>	<p><b>Hendri Tamara Yuda</b></p>
<p><b>Department, University &amp; Country</b></p>	<p><b>Universitas Muhammadiyah Gombong, Indonesia</b></p>