

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58506

*Title: Stress During Clinical Postings in Anaesthesia and Operation Theatre Technology Education: A Narrative Review*

### 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 Name: Dr S. K. Nath

### Detailed Reviewer's Report

#### Strength of the study:

- The review addresses a relevant and timely educational topic
- The objective is clearly stated and well focused
- The manuscript is logically organized with appropriate thematic sections
- Current and relevant literature has been included
- Practical recommendations for educators are provided
- Research gaps and future directions are clearly identified
- The review is useful for improving clinical education and student well-being

#### Weakness of the study:

- The review lacks a detailed literature search strategy
- Database names and search period should be clearly reported
- No formal quality assessment of included studies was performed
- Ethical considerations related to review methodology are not mentioned
- Some sections contain repetitive information
- Critical analysis could be stronger instead of descriptive summaries
- Greater emphasis on A&OTT-specific evidence would improve the review

#### Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript presents a well-organized narrative review on stress experienced during clinical postings in Anaesthesia and Operation Theatre Technology education. The topic is important and has practical relevance for educators, students, and clinical instructors. The review summarizes available evidence in a clear manner and provides useful recommendations to improve clinical learning and student well-being. The writing is generally clear and easy to follow, although minor grammatical errors, repetition, and language inconsistencies should be corrected to improve readability. As this is a narrative review, ethical clearance is generally not required; however, the authors should clearly mention this or provide an appropriate statement if required by the journal. The limitations are appropriately acknowledged, particularly the limited evidence specific to A&OTT students and the absence of quality assessment of included studies. Overall, the manuscript is informative, relevant, and contributes meaningful insights. Minor revisions will further improve its clarity and overall quality.

#### Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to be an original narrative review, and there is no obvious indication that it has been published elsewhere. No apparent evidence of duplicate publication was identified during review. However, the journal should perform a routine plagiarism similarity check before publication to verify originality and ensure compliance with publication ethics.