



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56437

Title: IMPACT OF BOOKLET REGARDING ROOMING IN AMONG NURSING STUDENTS IN A SELECTED NURSING COLLEGE IN BANGALORE

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revisionYES.....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			√	
Techn. Quality			√	
Clarity				√
Significance		√		

Reviewer Name: Prof. Dr. Dillip Kumar Mohapatra

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Overall Evaluation

The manuscript addresses an important educational issue related to rooming-in practices recommended by the World Health Organization and UNICEF under the Baby-Friendly Hospital Initiative (BFHI). The study attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of an information booklet in improving knowledge among final-year nursing students.

The topic is relevant to maternal–newborn care education; however, methodological and presentation-related concerns limit its current suitability for publication without major revision.

STRENGTHS

1. Relevant and Timely Topic

Rooming-in is a core component of BFHI.

Educational preparedness of nursing students is an important but underexplored area.

2. Clear Objective

One-group pre-test post-test design limits causal inference.

Hawthorne effect and testing effect not controlled.

Small Sample Size (N = 41)

Limits generalizability.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

No sample size calculation provided.

Convenience Sampling

Introduces selection bias.

Immediate Post-Test

No long-term retention assessment.

Instrument Validity & Reliability

Reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) not reported.

Validation process insufficiently described.

B. Statistical & Reporting Issues

Hypothesis Framing Incorrect

H0 incorrectly states "There will be significant difference."

Should state: "There will be no significant difference."

Data Inconsistencies

Gender percentage mismatch (66% male, 16% female = 82%).

Prior information percentage mismatch (76% yes, 6% no = 82%).

Discussion Contradiction

Results show 76% had poor knowledge.

Discussion states "average knowledge in pre-test."

P-value Reporting

"0.000" should be reported as $p < 0.001$.

C. Writing & Structural Issues

Numerous grammatical errors.

Typographical errors:

"Roming-in"

"Receved"

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Formatting issues in tables.

Literature review is limited.

No theoretical framework mentioned.

No effect size reported.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Academic Significance

Contributes to nursing education research.

Highlights knowledge gaps among final-year students.

Clinical Significance

Better-trained nurses may improve breastfeeding promotion.

Supports BFHI implementation.

Policy Significance

May justify inclusion of structured modules on rooming-in in nursing curricula.

However, the impact remains limited due to:

Small sample

Single institution

Lack of long-term outcome assessment

KEY POINTS FOR REVISION

Correct hypothesis statements.

Correct demographic percentage errors.

Provide:

Reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha)

Expert validation details

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Add sample size justification.

Improve discussion by:

Comparing with similar studies

Avoiding contradictions

Report effect size (Cohen's d).

Strengthen literature review (recent 2022–2024 references).

Revise English thoroughly.

Clarify indigenous context section with concrete examples.

Consider adding a limitations paragraph in detail.

RECOMMENDATION

Major Revision Required

The study has educational value and potential for publication, but substantial methodological clarification, statistical correction, and language improvement are required before acceptance.

It is **not recommended for acceptance in its current form**, but may be reconsidered after major revision.

WHY MAJOR REVISION?

TITLE (Lines 1–3)

Issue:

“Rooming – In” formatting inconsistent.

“In among” is grammatically incorrect.

“Selected Nursing College” lacks specificity (which limits indexing and transparency).

Why Major?

Title clarity affects indexing, citation, and discoverability. Poorly structured titles are often desk-rejected in indexed journals.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

ABSTRACT (Lines 5–26)

Lines 11–12

“A descriptive research design with a one-group pre-test post-test approach”

Issue:

Incorrect terminology. This is **pre-experimental**, not descriptive.

Design misclassification affects methodological credibility.

Why Major?

Incorrect study design labeling is a fundamental methodological error.

Lines 16–18

76% poor, 6% average, none good (pre-test)

Issue:

These percentages do not total 100%.

Missing clarity whether rounding was applied.

Why Major?

Numerical inconsistency undermines statistical reliability.

Line 20

($p < 0.05$)

Issue:

Later results show $p = 0.000$.

Should be reported as $p < 0.001$, not 0.000.

Why Major?

Incorrect statistical reporting violates journal statistical standards.

Overall Abstract Issue

No effect size reported.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

No mention of design limitation.

Overstated conclusion (“effective”) without control group.

Why Major?

Abstract misrepresents strength of evidence.

INTRODUCTION (*Lines 30–46*)

Lines 31–32

References to:

World Health Organization

UNICEF

Issue:

No in-text citation format provided.

No updated (2022–2024) references.

Why Major?

Weak literature grounding reduces scholarly rigor.

Lines 39–41

“Limited research focuses specifically...”

Issue:

Claim made without citation.

No gap analysis or systematic evidence provided.

Why Major?

Unsubstantiated research gap weakens justification.

IMPACT IN INDIGENOUS CONTEXT (*Lines 47–55*)

Issue:

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Section is generic.

No data on indigenous or cultural practices.

No empirical support.

Why Major?

Section appears conceptual and not evidence-based.

HYPOTHESIS (Lines 67–72)

Line 68

H0: There will be significant difference

Issue:

Null hypothesis incorrectly written.

H0 should state **no significant difference**.

Lines 69–72

H1 and H2 unclear.

Post-test association hypothesis incomplete.

Why Major?

Fundamental hypothesis formulation error = core statistical flaw.

MATERIALS & METHODS (Lines 73–101)

Lines 74–78

One-group pre-test post-test design.

Issue:

No control group.

No randomization.

No blinding.

No control for testing effect.

Why Major?

Threats to internal validity:

REVIEWER'S REPORT

History

Maturation

Testing effect

Hawthorne effect

Causal claims cannot be made.

Lines 79–80

Sample size = 41.

Issue:

No sample size calculation.

No power analysis.

Why Major?

Statistical validity not justified.

Line 80

Convenience sampling.

Issue:

Selection bias.

No generalizability.

Lines 85–87

Reliability was established through internal consistency.

Issue:

Cronbach's alpha not reported.

Validation process not described.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Why Major?

Measurement tool credibility unclear.

Lines 87–92

Immediate post-test.

Issue:

No follow-up.

Measures short-term recall only.

Why Major?

Cannot claim educational effectiveness long-term.

DATA ANALYSIS (Lines 96–101)

Issue:

Assumptions for paired t-test not tested.

Normality not reported.

Effect size not reported.

Chi-square inappropriate for small cells.

Why Major?

Statistical rigor insufficient for indexed journals.

RESULTS (Lines 136–173)

Table 1 (Lines 137–145)

Major Numerical Errors:

Male 66%, Female 16% = 82% (should be 34% female).

Yes 76%, No 6% = 82%.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Percentages inconsistent with text explanation.

Why Major?

Basic arithmetic inconsistency severely affects credibility.

Table 2 (Lines 147–155)

Pre-test percentages incomplete.

Post-test totals unclear.

Table 3 (Lines 158–162)

$p = 0.000$

Issue:

Incorrect reporting.

Table 4 (Lines 165–173)

Variables listed:

Locality

Family type

Religion

But earlier demographic variables:

Age

Gender

Prior information

Source of information

Issue:

Mismatch between methods and results.

Why Major?

Inconsistency in variable reporting.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

DISCUSSION (Lines 174–199)

Line 177

“Most students had only average knowledge in the pre-test”

Issue:

Contradiction. Results show 76% poor knowledge.

Why Major?

Internal inconsistency between Results and Discussion.

Lines 182–186

“Consistent with previous studies”

Issue:

No direct citation or comparison data provided.

CONCLUSION (Lines 200–216)

Issue:

Overstates effectiveness.

No mention of methodological limitations in conclusion.

Implies curriculum reform without strong evidence.

Why Major?

Conclusions exceed study design strength.

REFERENCES (Lines 231–263)

Issues:

Some outdated (2013).

Formatting inconsistent.

Journal indexing unclear.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

No reference to Indian nursing education context.

Why Major?

Reference quality influences journal acceptance.

CORE REASONS FOR MAJOR REVISION

Incorrect hypothesis structure.

Numerical and percentage inconsistencies.

Statistical reporting errors.

Methodological weakness (no control group).

Tool reliability not reported.

Internal contradictions.

Weak literature integration.

Overstated conclusions.

Why NOT Minor Revision?

Minor revision applies when:

Only grammar corrections needed.

Minor formatting issues exist

Here, problems are:

Methodological

Statistical

Conceptual

Reporting-related

Therefore: **Major Revision justified.**