

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_129679
Title of the Manuscript:	THE RELATIONSHIP OF KNOWLEDGE WITH READINESS TOWARD MENOPAUSE IN PREMENOPAUSE MOTHER CASE STUDY IN THE REJOMULYO RT 32 MUANG DALAM AREA
Type of the Article	Research

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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 addresses an essential topic concerning the relationship between knowledge and readiness for menopause in premenopausal women. It contributes to the scientific understanding of how knowledge can influence women's attitudes and preparedness for a significant life transition. Given the growing population of menopausal women globally, especially in developing countries, this research offers insights that could improve health education and intervention programs. Its focus on a specific community provides a localized perspective that may serve as a reference for similar studies in other regions.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title, "The Relationship of Knowledge with Readiness Toward Menopause in Premenopause Mothers: A Case Study in the Rejomulyo RT 32 Muang Dalam Area," is informative but could be refined for clarity and brevity. A suggested alternative title could be: "Knowledge and Readiness for Menopause: Insights from Premenopausal Women in Rejomulyo, Samarinda"	
<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 could benefit from slight modifications: Highlight the significance of the study more explicitly in a global context, emphasizing its relevance for developing countries. Include key results (e.g., statistical findings such as the p-value) to strengthen the summary's scientific rigor.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with clear methodology, results, and analysis. The statistical methods, particularly the use of chi-square tests, are appropriate for the study's aims. However, more discussion on the broader implications of the findings and comparisons with global data could enhance the manuscript's impact.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are sufficient and include recent studies, but adding more international sources could enhance the manuscript's global relevance. Suggested additional references: WHO reports or guidelines on menopause and aging. Studies exploring the psychological and social dimensions of menopause in diverse cultural contexts.	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript's English is understandable but could benefit from minor editing to improve fluency and scholarly tone. For instance:          Ensure consistent use of terms like "premenopausal" instead of alternating with "pre-menopausal."          Rephrase lengthy or repetitive sentences for better readability.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Insufficient depth in discussing existing literature: While the manuscript cites several relevant studies, the literature review does not critically analyze or synthesize findings from previous research. This weakens the context for the study and its contribution to the field.</p> <p>The problem statement lacks clarity on how the study's findings address specific gaps in the existing knowledge or resolve practical issues.</p> <p>There is no mention of a theoretical framework guiding the study. For example, models related to health behavior change (e.g., the Health Belief Model) could have been used to link knowledge and readiness conceptually.</p> <p>The research is focused on a very localized population (Rejomulyo RT 32 Muang Dalam), but the findings are discussed as if they apply more broadly. The manuscript does not adequately address the limitations regarding the generalizability of its results.</p> <p>The study does not sufficiently position its findings within a global or regional context, missing an opportunity to compare results with other populations or emphasize cultural-specific factors influencing menopause readiness.</p> <p>A total sample size of 31 respondents is very small, limiting the statistical power of the study. The manuscript does not discuss whether this sample size is adequate to detect meaningful differences or relationships.</p> <p>The manuscript uses total sampling (all members of the population), which is appropriate for small populations but limits external validity. The lack of justification for this method in relation to study objectives is a gap.</p> <p>The chi-square test requires that expected cell frequencies in contingency tables should ideally be 5 or more. With only 31 respondents, some categories may violate this assumption, making the results less reliable. The manuscript does not report the expected frequencies or address this issue.</p> <p>While the p-value is reported (<math>p = 0.023</math>), there is no discussion of effect size or the strength of the relationship between knowledge and readiness. Reporting measures like Cramér's V would provide more insight into the practical significance of the findings.</p> <p>Confidence intervals for proportions (e.g., knowledge levels, readiness levels) and the association (chi-square) are not provided. This omission makes it harder to evaluate the precision and reliability of the results.</p> <p>The categorization of knowledge levels (e.g., "not enough," "sufficient," "good") is not fully explained or justified. The thresholds for these categories appear arbitrary and may introduce bias into the analysis. Some tables (e.g., Tables 5 and 7) include raw percentages but lack summary statistics like mean, standard deviation, or median, which are useful for understanding the distribution of knowledge and readiness levels.</p> <p>The manuscript addresses a relevant and significant topic concerning menopause readiness in premenopausal women.</p> <p>The methodology (quantitative analytical design) is suitable for the research objectives.</p> <p>The findings provide valuable insights for localized health education and intervention programs.</p> <p>Major academic issues, such as the lack of a theoretical framework and limited engagement with existing literature.</p> <p>Statistical issues, including the small sample size and possible violations of chi-square test assumptions, reduce the reliability of the results.</p> <p>The manuscript lacks sufficient depth in discussing the broader implications of its findings and their generalizability.</p> <p>Language and presentation require substantial refinement for clarity and scholarly rigor.</p> <p>Recommendation: Serious Major Revision</p> <p>The manuscript has potential but requires significant revisions to improve its academic depth, statistical rigor, and presentation quality. It could be reconsidered after these improvements are made.</p>	

**PART 2:**

**Review Form 3**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Fahri Özsungur</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>Mersin University, Turkiye</b>