



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57872

Title: Effect of Implementing an Educational Program on Clinical Outcomes for Patients with Laminectomy.

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR-198

Detailed Reviewer's Report

This manuscript addresses an important nursing and rehabilitation topic and demonstrates that a structured educational program may improve postoperative outcomes in laminectomy patients. However, the study has substantial methodological, reporting, statistical, and language issues that limit its scientific rigor and publication readiness.

Major Comments

- Study methodology needs clarification** – Group allocation procedures and intervention details (sessions, duration, content, delivery method) are insufficiently described.
- Statistical analysis requires improvement** – Repeated measurements should be analyzed using more appropriate methods (e.g., repeated measures ANOVA), and effect sizes/confidence intervals should be reported.
- Baseline comparability is incomplete** – Clinical outcomes (pain, disability, psychological status) should be compared between groups before intervention.
- Outcome assessment timing is unclear** – The exact timing of post-test and follow-up assessments should be specified.
- Postoperative complications analysis is inadequate** – Complications should be compared between study and control groups with appropriate statistical testing.
- Study limitations are missing** – Limitations such as single-center design, small sample size, non-randomized sampling, and self-reported measures should be discussed.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Minor Comments

1. The manuscript contains numerous grammatical and language errors and requires professional English editing.
2. Terminology is inconsistent (laminectomy, lumbar decompression surgery, lumbar disc surgery, etc.).
3. The knowledge questionnaire section mistakenly refers to "thalassemia," suggesting a copy-editing error.
4. Tables and figures require clearer labeling and presentation.
5. P-values should be reported according to standard scientific conventions (e.g., $p < 0.001$).
6. References and citation formatting should be carefully reviewed for consistency.