

## Review Form 1.6

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JPRI_82480   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Psychometric properties of Cohen's Perceived Stress Scale among atrial fibrillation patients - A cross-sectional study findings |
| Type of the Article      |   |

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

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|                                     | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is dubbed as “cross-sectional study”, yet it seems to be lacking a comparison of data set from the selected subject which is a common and necessary aspect of such study. Perhaps, a more extensive explanation of the nature of the study design is required.</li> <li>2. The author/s should be more versed and particular in explaining the results of the study in terms of whether it signified (and proven) “reliability” and/or “validity of the test. From strict test development perspective, the measures undertaken were only limited to establishing reliability and not the validity.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1. The claim for convergent validity was shaky since the author/s did not establish a strong correlational score from another relatively similar measurement procedure. It only considered relationship between factor loadings – which only assumes factors related together in terms of measuring the target construct.</li> <li>2.2. Floor and ceiling effects were not presented nor explained in detail.</li> <li>2.3. Explain the need to use both EFA and CFA even though the test has already been established, and the main goal was only to establish its reliability (and factorial validity in this case) among the identified population.</li> <li>2.4. Give much emphasis about the need to, and importance of, the use of the said scale among the identified population.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. The tables presented are not essential to the main results of the study. The results of the statistical treatments must be given more importance in a more inclusive table that will present the rigor of the analysis (i.e., the factor loading, varimax rotation, RMSEA, floor and ceiling effect, etc should be highlighted more to give more emphasis to the established psychometric properties of the test). These shall be explained more in details and more eloquently. The presented table are non-substantial, and explanations needs more depth.</li> <li>4. Presentation of results can be done in a more structured manner by presenting each statistical treatment and how they resulted into the psychometric soundness of the test.</li> <li>5. Provide pertinent recommendation relative to the gathered data and their limitations.</li> </ol> |  |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p>The presentation of the methods needs to be arranged in a more intact manner (i.e., provide 1 cohesive subheading as the “materials and methods” and “statistical analyses” seem to be confusing as both contains statistical treatments.</p>   |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    |  |  |

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Argel B. Masanda</b>   |
| Department, University & Country | <b>National University Baliwag &amp; Wesleyan University Philippines, Philippines</b> |