

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ARJGO_128288 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | EFFECTS OF EDUCATION GIVEN ACCORDING TO WATSON'S THEORY OF HUMAN CARING ON PREGNANCY DISTRESS: A RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL |
| 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> |
|---|---|---|
| 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. | This manuscript addresses a significant issue regarding the impact of educational interventions on pregnancy distress, particularly through the lens of Watson's Theory of Human Caring. The study's findings could contribute to the existing body of knowledge on maternal mental health and inform nursing practices. Given the prevalence of stress during pregnancy, the implications for prenatal care are critical. This research could also encourage further studies in diverse cultural contexts, enhancing the generalizability of the findings. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title is generally suitable; however, it could be more concise. A suggested alternative: "Impact of Watson's Theory of Human Caring Education on Pregnancy Distress: A Randomized Controlled Trial." | |
| 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. | The abstract is comprehensive but could include specific numerical results to enhance clarity. For example, stating the exact percentage reduction in distress scores would provide a clearer picture of the intervention's effectiveness. Also, adding the clinical implication, future research will be beneficial | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Overall, the manuscript is scientifically correct, but some sections require grammatical and structural improvements for clarity. For instance, phrases such as "the research was conducted with 128 pregnant women" could be rephrased to "a total of 128 pregnant women participated in the study." Additionally, the flow and coherence in some areas need refinement. Please review the whole paper, as almost everywhere the flow grammar needs improvements, please write in academic style. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The references are mostly sufficient, but some could be more recent. Consider adding studies from the last two years to ensure the literature review is up to date. | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The language quality requires improvement. Several sentences are awkwardly constructed, and grammatical errors are present. For example, "it has been determined that the training provided with given according to Watson's Theory" should be corrected to "it has been determined that the training provided according to Watson's Theory." A thorough grammar and style check is recommended.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>The statistical analysis is not adequately described. The manuscript should clearly state the statistical methods used, including whether the data were continuous or ordinal. For instance, if the TPDS scores are continuous, the authors should indicate that appropriate parametric tests (e.g., t-tests, ANOVA) were employed. Furthermore, the sample size calculation is not discussed, which is essential for understanding the study's power and reliability.</p> <p>There is no demographic characteristics table, which should be included as Table 1 to provide a clearer overview of participant demographics.</p> <p>The authors did not sufficiently discuss the risks of bias and limitations....For example, associated with the single-blind design..... , potential biases could arise from the lack of blinding for participants, which may influence their responses. Additionally, the limitations of generalizability due to the study being conducted in a single location should be addressed. Generalisability (external validity, applicability) of the trial findings</p> <p>Funding information?</p> | |

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>Name:</p> | <p>Malasevskiaia Iana</p> |
| <p>Department, University & Country</p> | <p>Yemen</p> |