



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-57223

Title: CART-CELL THERAPY AMONG BSC NURSING STUDENTS IN DEHRADUN

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****

****1.Strengths of the Manuscript****

* The topic is ****highly relevant and contemporary****, focusing on advanced cancer immunotherapy (CAR-T therapy).

* Addresses an ****important gap in nursing education****, particularly awareness among undergraduate nursing students.

* Includes a ****clear research objective and hypothesis****.

* Provides a ****comprehensive background**** on CAR-T therapy, including mechanism, applications, and complications.

* Attempts to link findings with ****clinical implications for nursing practice****.

* Identifies ****research gaps****, especially in the Indian context.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

*** Includes discussion, comparison with literature, and implications, which strengthen academic depth.**

□ **2. Weaknesses / Major Concerns**

□ Critical Issues (Must be corrected)

*** **Abstract is completely irrelevant** (solid waste management topic mismatch).**

*** **Keywords missing** (filled with "000000000000").**

*** **Title-content inconsistency** reduces credibility.**

*** **No proper methodology section**:**

*** Sampling technique not clearly described**

*** Tool validation missing**

*** Statistical analysis not explained**

*** **Use of questionable/future references (e.g., 2025 citations)** – may not be authentic.**

*** **Repetition of objectives and content** (duplicated sections).**

*** **Formatting issues**:**

*** Line numbering artifacts**

*** Poor paragraph structuring**

*** **Ethical approval not mentioned** (essential for human studies).**

□ □ Moderate Issues

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- * **Overly lengthy introduction; lacks concise focus.**
- * **Language and grammar need improvement.**
- * **Literature review is descriptive but ****not critically synthesized****.**
- * **No clear ****tables/figures**** for results.**
- * **Discussion repeats results instead of deeper interpretation.**

□ ****3. Key Points of the Study****

- * **Assesses ****knowledge level of CAR-T therapy**** among B.Sc. Nursing students.**

- * **Finds:**

- * ****36% good knowledge****

- * ****48% average knowledge****

- * ****16% poor knowledge****

- * **Identifies ****significant knowledge gaps**** in:**

- * **Mechanism of action**

- * **Complications (CRS, ICANS)**

- * **Nursing management**

- * **Highlights need for ****curriculum improvement and training programs****.**

□ ****4. Significance of the Study****

- * **Highly significant in:**

- * ****Oncology nursing education****

REVIEWER'S REPORT

****Emerging immunotherapy awareness****

Provides baseline data for:

Curriculum development

Training modules in India

Relevant for:

Nursing educators

Hospital administrators

Policy makers

Supports integration of advanced therapies into undergraduate teaching

However, significance is currently undermined by poor presentation and methodological gaps.

5. Reviewer's Recommendation

Decision: MAJOR REVISION REQUIRED

6. Specific Recommendations for Improvement

A. Abstract (Highest Priority)

Rewrite completely to include:

Background

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- * Aim
- * Method
- * Results
- * Conclusion

B. Methodology Section (Must Add Clearly)

- * Study design (descriptive/cross-sectional)
- * Sample size and sampling method
- * Inclusion/exclusion criteria
- * Data collection tool (questionnaire validation)
- * Statistical analysis (e.g., chi-square, mean, SD)

C. References

- * Remove or verify all ****2025/future references****
- * Use ****authentic indexed sources**** (Scopus/PubMed)

D. Structure Improvement

- * Remove duplication of objectives
- * Improve headings and formatting
- * Add tables/graphs for results

REVIEWER'S REPORT

E. Ethical Considerations

* Add:

* Institutional ethical approval

* Consent from participants

F. Language Editing

* Professional English editing required

* Remove grammatical and typographical errors

Final Comment

The manuscript has a ****strong and relevant research idea****, but in its current form, it ****does not meet publication standards**** due to major structural, methodological, and content errors. With ****substantial revision****, it has the potential to become a publishable paper.

MAJOR REVISION JUSTIFICATION

1. **Title vs Abstract Mismatch (Lines 1-15)**

* ****Issue:**** Title focuses on ***CAR-T cell therapy knowledge among nursing students***, but

REVIEWER'S REPORT

****Abstract (Lines 8–12)** discusses ****solid waste management in Tamil Nadu****.**

*** **Problem:** Completely unrelated topic → indicates possible copy-paste or manuscript assembly error.**

*** **Impact:** Makes the paper scientifically invalid at first glance.**

****Required Revision:****

*** Rewrite abstract strictly aligned with CAR-T therapy study.**

*** Include: background, objectives, methods, results, conclusion.**

2. **Keywords Missing (Lines 13–15)**

*** “000000000000” is not acceptable.**

*** No indexing possible.**

****Fix:****

Add 4–6 keywords like:

*** CAR-T therapy**

*** Nursing students**

*** Knowledge assessment**

*** Immunotherapy**

*** Oncology nursing**

3. **Introduction Overly Long & Poorly Structured (Lines 21–68)**

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- * Too descriptive, like a review article.
- * Lacks clear transition to ****research problem****.
- * Some sentences missing punctuation (e.g., line 32).

****Issues:****

- * No subheadings
- * Redundant explanations of CAR-T generations
- * Weak linkage to nursing education

****Fix:****

- * Reduce length by ~30–40%
- * Focus on:
 - * What is known
 - * What is unknown
 - * Why nursing students matter

4. ****Research Problem Formatting Poor (Lines 69-71)****

- * Written inline without clarity.

****Fix:****

Use proper format:

> ****“A descriptive study to assess the level of knowledge...”****

REVIEWER'S REPORT

5. **Rationale Repetitive (Lines 71–86)**

*** Same points repeated from introduction:**

*** CAR-T importance**

*** Complications**

*** Need for awareness**

****Fix:****

*** Shorten and focus on ****gap + justification******

6. **Objectives Repeated Twice (Lines 87–109)**

*** Exact duplication of objectives section.**

****Impact:** Shows poor manuscript organization.**

****Fix:****

*** Keep only one structured section.**

7. **Hypothesis Weak & Not Statistically Framed (Lines 97–99)**

REVIEWER'S REPORT

* "Students have adequate knowledge" → vague

* No null hypothesis (H_0)

****Fix:****

* **Add:**

* H_0 : No significant association...

* H_1 : Significant association...

8. ****Missing Methodology Section (CRITICAL)****

* **No details on:**

* **Study design**

* **Sample size calculation**

* **Sampling technique**

* **Tool validation**

* **Ethical approval**

* **Statistical analysis**

****Impact:**** Study is ****not reproducible**** → major rejection risk.

****Fix:****

Add full **Methodology section:**

* **Descriptive cross-sectional design**

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- * Sample = 100
- * Tool reliability (Cronbach's alpha)
- * Statistical tests (Chi-square, etc.)

9. ****Review of Literature Too Long & Descriptive (Lines 110–316)****

- * Reads like a textbook or systematic review.
- * No synthesis or critical analysis.
- * Excessive numerical details without interpretation.

****Problems:****

- * No thematic grouping
- * No comparison between studies
- * Weak linkage to research gap

****Fix:****

* Organize into themes:

- * Clinical efficacy
- * Complications
- * Nursing role
- * Reduce length by 30–50%

REVIEWER'S REPORT

10. **Research Gap Section Acceptable but Needs Sharpening (Lines 317–338)**

*** Good identification but too verbose.**

****Fix:****

*** Convert into bullet points**

*** Add citations supporting gap**

11. **Conceptual Framework (HBM) Not Properly Presented (Lines 339–366)**

*** Only textual explanation**

*** No diagram/figure**

****Fix:****

*** Add **visual model diagram****

*** Show variable relationships**

12. **Results Section Missing (CRITICAL)**

*** Only “Discussion” present.**

*** No tables, no statistical results.**

REVIEWER'S REPORT

****Impact:**** Scientific validity compromised.

****Fix:****

Add:

* Frequency tables

* Mean \pm SD

* Graphs (optional)

13. ****Discussion Section Weak Structurally (Lines 367–402)****

* Some comparison with literature present

* **But:**

* No deep interpretation

* No explanation of **why** results occurred

****Fix:****

* **Add reasoning:**

* curriculum gaps

* exposure differences

14. ****Use of Unverified Citations (e.g., 2025 studies)****

REVIEWER'S REPORT

* Several citations like:

* Quan et al., 2025

* Wang et al., 2025

****Issue:****

* May not be published or verifiable.

****Fix:****

* Replace with real indexed references

15. ****Language & Grammar Issues Throughout****

Examples:

* Line 8: “nearby study analyses...”

* Line 31: missing punctuation

* Repetition and long sentences

****Fix:****

* Professional English editing required

16. ****Formatting Issues****

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- * Line numbering inconsistent
- * Paragraph breaks poor
- * Symbols like “❖”, “➤” inconsistent for journal format

17. ****Conclusion Repetitive (Lines 448–456)****

- * Same points repeated multiple times

****Fix:****

- * Make concise and impactful

****FINAL REVIEWER RECOMMENDATION****

Decision: **MAJOR REVISION**

Justification Summary:

- * Fundamental mismatch (Title vs Abstract)
- * Missing methodology and results (critical flaw)
- * Redundancy and duplication
- * Poor structure and formatting
- * Weak statistical and scientific presentation