



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 revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer's ID: Sahil Srivastava

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. Overall Evaluation

The manuscript evaluates the effectiveness of an information booklet on knowledge regarding rooming-in among fourth-year B.Sc. nursing students. The topic is relevant to maternal and newborn care education and aligns with WHO and Baby-Friendly Hospital Initiative recommendations. The study demonstrates that structured educational interventions may improve nursing students' knowledge. However, the manuscript contains several methodological, structural, and language issues that must be corrected before publication.

Strengths of the Study

1. The topic is clinically relevant to maternal–infant health.
2. The intervention (information booklet) is simple and practical for nursing education.
3. Appropriate statistical tests such as paired t-test and chi-square were used.
4. The results clearly show a significant improvement in knowledge scores after intervention.

For example, the mean knowledge score increased from 4.76 to 13.95 after the booklet intervention according to the results section.

Major Issues (Must be Corrected)

1. Hypothesis is Incorrectly Written

The hypotheses are logically wrong.

Example in manuscript:

H0: There will be significant difference between mean of pre-test and post-test score.

This is incorrect.

Correct format:

H0: There is no significant difference between pre-test and post-test knowledge scores.

H1: There is a significant difference between pre-test and post-test knowledge scores.

2. Study Design is Weak

The study uses:

One-group pretest posttest design

This design has low internal validity because:

- No control group
- Testing effect may occur
- Learning effect possible

Authors should mention this clearly in limitations.

3. Sample Size Justification Missing

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Sample size = 41 students but:

- No sample size calculation
- No power analysis

This weakens the research validity.

4. Tool Validation Not Explained Properly

The manuscript says:

Tool validated by experts and reliability ensured through internal consistency.

But missing:

- Number of experts
- CVI or content validation method
- Cronbach alpha value

This must be reported.

5. Statistical Reporting Errors

Example:

p value written as

$p = 0.000$

Correct format:

$p < 0.001$

6. Demographic Table Errors

Table 1 has mistakes.

Example:

Gender:

Male = 33 (66%)

Female = 8 (16%)

Total should be 100%, but it is 82%.

This is a serious calculation error and must be corrected.

7. Poor Discussion Section

Discussion is weak.

Authors only explain their findings but do not compare adequately with previous studies.

Discussion should include:

- 4–6 comparison studies
- Interpretation of results
- Clinical significance

8. Limited References

Only 9 references are included.

For a research article minimum 15–20 references are expected.

Also:

- Many references are old
- Few from last 5 years

Minor Issues

1. Grammar Problems

Examples:

“healthcare provider” → should be healthcare providers

“ROMING-IN” spelling mistake in table.

2. Formatting Problems

Some sections contain:

- spacing errors
- inconsistent font

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- table alignment issues

3. Abstract Needs Structure

Abstract should follow structured format:

- Background
- Methods
- Results
- Conclusion

4. Keywords

Keywords should follow MeSH terms.

Example:

Rooming-in

Breastfeeding

Maternal-infant bonding

Nursing education

BFHI

Specific Suggestions to Authors

1. Correct hypotheses.
2. Provide tool reliability and validation details.
3. Correct demographic table percentages.
4. Improve discussion with comparison studies.
5. Add more recent references.
6. Revise language and grammar throughout manuscript.
7. Correct statistical reporting format.

Final Decision: Major Revision Required

The study addresses an important topic but requires methodological clarification, statistical correction, and improved discussion before it can be considered for publication.