



## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56915

**Title: A Quasi-Experimental Study to Assess the Effectiveness of Group Therapy on Psychological Wellbeing Among Patients Undergoing Hemodialysis in Selected Hospital, Coimbatore**

**Recommendation:**

Accept after major revision

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

Reviewer's ID: Dr Payal Adwani(PT)

### *Detailed Reviewer's Report*

#### **Major Concerns:**

##### **1. Methodological Issues**

- Sampling method (**purposive sampling**) may introduce bias; justification is not adequately discussed.
- Lack of clarity regarding:
  - Randomisation (not done but not explicitly stated)
  - Blinding (not mentioned)
  - Validity and reliability of the **modified questionnaire**
- No ethical approval statement mentioned.

##### **2. Statistical Errors & Inconsistencies**

- Reported **mean difference (29)** is incorrect (pretest 6.2 vs posttest 24.5 → difference  $\approx 18.3$ ).
- Inconsistent reporting of values across sections (e.g., discussion vs results).
- Extremely high **t-values (31.66, 30.70)** raise concerns about calculation or reporting accuracy.
- No confidence intervals reported.
- Chi-square values reported as "0" without explanation.

### REVIEWER'S REPORT

#### 3. Data Presentation Issues

- Tables are:
  - Poorly formatted
  - Difficult to interpret
  - Contain spacing and alignment errors
- Redundant repetition of results in text and tables.
- Terminology inconsistency:
  - “knowledge” used instead of “psychological wellbeing” in discussion.

#### 4. Language and Grammar

- Numerous grammatical and typographical errors:
  - “patients undergo hemodialysis” → *patients undergoing hemodialysis*
  - “level of knowledge” used incorrectly
  - Missing spaces and formatting issues (e.g., “resultsalsoshowed”)
- Requires **thorough language editing**.

#### 5. Conceptual Issues

- Confusion between:
  - Psychological wellbeing
  - Knowledge outcomes
- Intervention (group therapy) is poorly described:
  - Duration
  - Content
  - Structure
  - Facilitator qualifications

#### 6. Discussion & Interpretation

- Discussion is largely **descriptive**, lacking:
  - Comparison with previous studies
  - Explanation of findings
  - Clinical implications
- Overgeneralised conclusion (“very effective”) without acknowledging limitations.

#### 7. References

- Mostly **outdated textbooks** (many >10 years old).
- Lack of **recent research articles (RCTs/systematic reviews)**.
- Improper formatting (spacing, incomplete URLs).

#### **Minor Concerns:**

- Title could be shortened for clarity
- Abstract lacks structured format

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Keywords are limited
- Repetition across sections