



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-56915

Title: A QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL STUDY TO ASSESS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF GROUP THERAPY ON PSYCHOLOGICAL WELLBEING AMONG PATIENTS UNDERGO HEMODIALYSIS IN SELECTED HOSPITAL, AT COIMBATORE

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's ID: JPR-094

Detailed Reviewer's Report

****Reviewer's Report****

****Title of Manuscript****

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

****1. Strengths of the Study****

*** **Relevant clinical topic**:** The study addresses psychological wellbeing in hemodialysis patients, which is an important and often neglected aspect of chronic kidney disease management.

*** **Clear objectives**:** The aims of assessing baseline wellbeing, intervention effectiveness, and demographic associations are well defined.

*** **Appropriate study design**:** A quasi-experimental pretest–posttest control group design is suitable for intervention-based research.

*** **Use of statistical tools**:** Application of paired and unpaired t-tests and chi-square tests indicates an attempt at inferential analysis.

*** **Practical intervention**:** Group therapy is a cost-effective and feasible intervention in clinical settings.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

□ ****2. Weaknesses of the Study****

****Major Issues****

****Statistical inconsistency**:**

*** Reported mean difference (**29**) does not match actual calculation ($24.5 - 6.2 \approx 18.3$).**

*** Extremely high t-values (31.66, 30.70) raise concerns about calculation accuracy.**

****Methodological limitations**:**

*** Purposive sampling limits generalizability.**

*** Sample size (**n = 60**) is relatively small.**

*** Lack of randomization and blinding introduces bias.**

****Tool validity not mentioned**:**

*** No details on reliability or validation of the “modified interview questionnaire”.**

****Intervention description inadequate**:**

*** Group therapy using “flashcards” is poorly explained (duration, content, structure missing).**

****Ethical considerations missing**:**

*** No mention of Institutional Ethics Committee approval.**

****Minor Issues****

*** Repetition of control group results.**

*** Use of inconsistent terms (“knowledge” instead of “psychological wellbeing”).**

*** Poor formatting of tables and headings.**

*** Grammatical and typographical errors.**

*** Lack of in-text citations despite references listed.**

****3. Key Points****

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- * The study demonstrates a **significant improvement in psychological wellbeing** after group therapy.
- * Control group shows **minimal change**, supporting intervention effectiveness.
- * No association found between demographic variables and wellbeing.
- * Findings support **non-pharmacological interventions** in chronic illness management.

4. Significance of the Study

- * Highlights the importance of **mental health care in chronic kidney disease patients**.
- * Supports integration of **group therapy in dialysis units**.
- * Contributes to **nursing and psychosocial intervention research**.
- * Useful for **resource-limited settings** due to low-cost intervention.

However, due to methodological and statistical concerns, the **current evidence strength is moderate to low**.

5. Recommendation

Decision: Major Revision Required

Justification:

The manuscript has potential but requires **substantial improvement** before it can be considered for publication:

Mandatory Revisions

1. Correct all **statistical errors and calculations**.
2. Provide **detailed description of group therapy intervention**.
3. Include **validity and reliability of the data collection tool**.
4. Add **ethical clearance statement**.
5. Improve **language, grammar, and formatting**.
6. Remove inconsistencies (e.g., "knowledge" vs "psychological wellbeing").
7. Add **recent and relevant in-text citations**.
8. Revise tables for clarity and standard formatting.

Final Comment to Author

REVIEWER'S REPORT

The study addresses an important clinical issue and shows promising results; however, ****serious concerns regarding statistical accuracy, methodology, and presentation must be addressed**** to meet publication standards.

****Reviewer Comments (Major Revision Required – Justification)****

****ABSTRACT SECTION****

****Line 7–14 (Background):****

* Background is ****too general and textbook-like****; lacks recent references.
* No clear ****research gap**** identified.

****Line 22–28 (Methods):****

* ****“Modified interview questionnaire” – no validity/reliability mentioned****.
* Sampling method (purposive) introduces ****selection bias****, not justified.

****Line 30–32 (Results):****

* ****Major statistical error****: Mean difference reported as ****29****, but actual difference is **~18.3**.
* ****Extremely high t-value (31.66)**** appears unrealistic → requires verification.

****Line 33:****

* ****“No significant association” – no statistical values (χ^2 , p-value) provided.**

****Line 35–37 (Conclusion):****

* ****Overgeneralized conclusion (“very effective”) without acknowledging limitations****.

****INTRODUCTION****

****Line 42–50:****

* Content is ****descriptive but lacks citations****.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

* No **recent studies (last 5 years)** cited.

Line 52–56:

* Statements like “90% kidney function loss” need **supporting references**.

Line 62–65:

* Claims about quality of life are **not supported with evidence**.

Line 66–69:

* Psychological wellbeing importance stated, but **no linkage to group therapy research gap**.

Major Issue: Introduction lacks **clear problem statement and novelty**.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Line 72–74:

* Study design mentioned, but **no justification** for choosing quasi-experimental design.

Line 75–77:

* Sample size (n=60) – **no sample size calculation provided**.

Line 78–80:

* Tool description inadequate:

* No **scoring system explained**

* No **validity/reliability testing**

Line 81–82:

* Group therapy intervention poorly described:

* No **duration, session details, content, frequency**

* “Flashcards” unclear as therapy modality

REVIEWER'S REPORT

****Line 80:****

*** Ethical aspects:**

- * No ****Institutional Ethics Committee approval******
- * No ethical clearance number**

****Line 85–89:****

*** Statistical analysis:**

- * Assumptions of t-test (normality) ****not discussed******
- * No software mentioned**

**RESULTS SECTION******

**Demographic Table (Line 91–93 onward)******

- * Poor formatting (spacing, alignment issues)**
- * No ****statistical comparison between groups at baseline******

**Table 2 (Psychological Wellbeing Levels)******

****Issue:****

- * Results are ****repeated twice**** (redundancy)**
- * 100% improvement in experimental group is ****highly unusual → needs justification******

**Line (Results Description)******

*** Language inconsistency:**

- * “knowledge” used instead of ****psychological wellbeing******

**Table 3(a) – Paired t-test******

REVIEWER'S REPORT

****Major statistical concern**:**

* $t = 31.66$ is unusually high → likely ****calculation error****
* Mean difference mismatch:

* Reported: 29

* Actual: ~18.3

Table 4(a) – Unpaired t-test

* $t = 30.70$ again ****unrealistically high****

* No confidence intervals provided

Table 5 (Chi-square)

* All values shown as “0” → statistically ****incorrect or poorly reported****

* No χ^2 values, no p-values → ****invalid interpretation****

DISCUSSION

****Major Issues:****

* Repetition of results instead of interpretation

* Again uses ****“knowledge”** instead of ****“psychological wellbeing”**

* No comparison with ****previous studies****

* No explanation of ****why intervention worked****

* No discussion of ****limitations****

Discussion lacks ****critical scientific analysis****

CONCLUSION

****Issues:****

* Overstated conclusion (“very effective”)

* Again incorrect term: “level of knowledge”

* No mention of:

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- * **Limitations**
- * **Future scope**
- * **Generalizability**

****REFERENCES****

- * **Mostly *old textbooks*, not research articles**
- * **No *recent journal references (last 5 years)***
- * **No *in-text citations linked to references***
- * **Web reference not properly formatted**

****OVERALL MAJOR ISSUES SUMMARY****

1. ***Serious statistical errors***
2. ***Lack of methodological clarity***
3. ***No tool validation***
4. ***Poor intervention description***
5. ***No ethical approval mentioned***
6. ***Inconsistent terminology***
7. ***Weak discussion (no literature support)***
8. ***Formatting and grammar issues***
9. ***Lack of recent references***

****FINAL RECOMMENDATION****

Decision: MAJOR REVISION REQUIRED

Reason:

The manuscript has a ***relevant topic and potential***, but due to:

- * ***critical statistical inconsistencies***
- * ***methodological gaps***
- * ***poor scientific presentation***

...it ***does not meet publication standards in its current form***.

What You Must Fix (Priority Order)

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

1. ✓ Correct all ****statistical calculations****
2. ✓ Clearly describe ****group therapy protocol****
3. ✓ Add ****tool validation (Cronbach's alpha, etc.)****
4. ✓ Include ****ethical approval statement****
5. ✓ Rewrite ****discussion with literature support****
6. ✓ Fix terminology consistency
7. ✓ Add ****recent journal references****
8. ✓ Improve formatting and grammar