

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 article is of great value to the scientific community because it expands the body of existing knowledge in its field and offers new viewpoints. By addressing a major need or providing innovative methods, the paper establishes the foundation for further study and practical applications. The findings may influence policy, guide future study, and suggest industrial or therapeutic approaches, all of which could advance the area.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Not suitable: I suggest a revised title as, "Impact of Watson's Human Caring-Based Education on Pregnancy Distress: A Randomized Controlled Trial"	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <p>1. Objective:</p> <p>Although the existing wording is clear but could be more concise. Consider rephrasing as shown below: <i>"The study aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of Watson's Theory of Human Caring-based education in reducing pregnancy distress."</i></p> <p>2. Methods:</p> <p>The explanation of the sample size and group assignments is repeated. Combine sentences to make them simpler: Consider rephrasing as shown below: <i>"This single-blind randomized controlled trial was conducted with 128 Turkish pregnant women (training group: 64, control group: 64) at Family Health Centers in Manisa."</i></p> <p>The phrase <i>"Pregnancy distress rate after the education based on Watson's Theory of Human Caring"</i> is incomplete and unclear. Reframe as: <i>"The primary outcome was pregnancy distress as measured by the Tilburg Pregnancy Distress Scale (TPDS), while the Watson Caritas Patient Score (WCPS) assessed the caring aspect of the intervention."</i></p> <p>3. Results:</p> <p>If available, give more context for the statistical results, such as effect sizes or particular numerical differences, if available. For example: <i>"Post-intervention, the training group showed significantly lower TPDS scores compared to the control group ($p < 0.05$), indicating reduced pregnancy distress."</i></p> <p>4. Conclusion:</p> <p>The sentence <i>"It has been determined that the training provided with given according to Watson's Theory of Human Caring to pregnant women is an effective initiative in decreased the distress of pregnant women"</i> is clumsily phrased and repetitious. Change to: <i>"The education based on Watson's Theory of Human Caring effectively reduced pregnancy distress in the intervention group, demonstrating its potential as a supportive strategy during pregnancy."</i></p> <p>5. Key Details:</p> <p>Add specific numeric results or percentages if available to strengthen the abstract (e.g., exact TPDS score differences or effect size).</p> <p>Clearly state the significance of the Watson Caritas Patient Score results if they were part of the findings.</p> <p>6. Grammar and Style:</p> <p>Correct minor errors, such as changing "provided with given" to "provided based on."</p> <p>Ensure consistency in terminology (e.g., always use "education" instead of "training" or vice versa).</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The main methodology and conclusions of the manuscript are accurate from a scientific standpoint. Its scientific rigour would be improved, nevertheless, by providing more information about the statistical analysis, randomisation procedure, and ethical issues. A more comprehensive assessment of the intervention's effects might be possible by elucidating how the Watson Caritas Patient Score supports the study's conclusions.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <p>1. Description of Randomization Process:</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>The manuscript does not describe the randomization process in detail. Include information on how participants were randomized, allocation concealment, and any stratification used.</p> <p>For example: <i>"Participants were randomized using a computer-generated sequence, with allocation concealment ensured through sealed envelopes."</i></p> <p>2. Blinding:</p> <p>Clarify how "single-blind" was implemented. Specify whether it refers to participant blinding or blinding of outcome assessors.</p> <p>3. Baseline Characteristics:</p> <p>Provide a table comparing baseline characteristics of the training and control groups to demonstrate equivalence and ensure randomization effectiveness.</p> <p>4. Statistical Analysis:</p> <p>The manuscript reports significant findings (e.g., p-values), but the statistical analysis section lacks detail.</p> <p>Specify the statistical tests used (e.g., t-tests, ANOVA, regression analysis).</p> <p>Include effect sizes, confidence intervals, or mean differences to provide more depth to the results.</p> <p>5. Watson Caritas Patient Score (WCPS):</p> <p>The manuscript does not elaborate on how WCPS findings relate to pregnancy distress. Clarify whether the WCPS was used as a secondary outcome and its implications.</p> <p>6. Limitations:</p> <p>Discuss potential limitations such as selection bias, self-reported measures, and generalizability to other populations.</p> <p>Example: <i>"The study's findings may be limited to Turkish pregnant women and may not generalize to other cultural contexts."</i></p> <p>7. Ethical Considerations:</p> <p>Include a clear statement about ethical approval and informed consent.</p> <p>For example: <i>"The study was approved by (specific ethics committee), and all participants provided written informed consent."</i></p> <p>8. Language and Clarity:</p> <p>Address grammatical errors and problematic phrasing for scientific clarity (e.g., "provided with given" should be "provided based on").</p> <p>Ensure consistency in terms like "education" and "training."</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The sources included appear thorough and cover a wide range of topics related to stress, discomfort, and psychological concerns during pregnancy, as well as nursing theories and interventions meant to lessen these problems. To guarantee the scientific correctness and applicability of the manuscript, the following observations are made for your consideration:</p> <p>1. Citation Consistency</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>Some references (e.g., those linked to Google Scholar) should be formatted consistently with others. Ensure proper citation style (e.g., APA, Vancouver) is uniformly applied.</p> <p>2. Outdated Sources</p> <p>A few references date back to 2005-2007 (e.g., Gagnon AJ, Heaman MI). Consider citing more recent studies where available to strengthen the manuscript's contemporary relevance.</p>	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality of the submitted work is generally suitable for scholarly communication since it follows established academic writing guidelines, has an academic tone, and is well-organized with reference.	
Optional/General comments	Generally, the manuscript is of a good scientific material and carry appropriate information regarding the field of study and practice.	

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:	Martin Awe Akilla
Department, University & Country	Bolgatanga Technical University, Ghana