



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLPwww.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55379

Title: The Effect of Self Care Protocol for Patients with Ureteric Double J Stent on their Health Outcomes**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

Date: 22.12.25*Detailed Reviewer's Report***Strengths of the Paper**

- Clear Research Objectives and Hypotheses:** The study explicitly states its aims, questions, and hypotheses, providing clarity on its focus.
- Comprehensive Methodology:** The paper details the research design, sample selection, tool validation, reliability testing, and intervention procedures, which enhances reproducibility.
- Use of Validated Instruments:** The questionnaires and checklists employed were validated and demonstrated high reliability, lending credibility to the findings.
- Integration of Theoretical Framework:** The study is grounded in Orem's Self-Care Theory, supporting a structured approach to patient education and self-management.
- Comparison Between Control and Study Groups:** The inclusion of a control group allows for clear assessment of the intervention's impact.
- Multiple Follow-up Assessments:** The study measures outcomes at several time points, providing insight into both short-term and longer-term effects.
- Acknowledgment of Ethical Considerations:** Ethical approval was obtained, and participant consent was addressed, demonstrating adherence to ethical standards.
- Significant Results with Practical Implications:** The findings emphasize the importance of self-care education in reducing complications, which has relevance for clinical practice.

Weaknesses of the Paper

- Limited Sample Size and Setting:** The purposive sample of 80 patients from a single hospital limits the generalizability of the findings.
- Insufficient Detail on Randomization and Blinding:** The methodology does not specify whether randomization or blinding was used, raising concerns about potential biases.
- Inadequate Discussion of Limitations:** The paper does not thoroughly discuss potential biases, limitations, or confounding factors that could affect results.
- Lack of Detailed Statistical Analysis:** While various tests are mentioned, detailed statistical data such as p-values and effect sizes are not comprehensively presented.
- Potential Overreliance on Self-Reported Data:** Self-care practices and symptoms are based on patient self-report, which could introduce bias.
- Inconsistent Citation Style:** The references are not uniformly formatted, which detracts from professionalism.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Limited Explanation of Follow-Up Procedures:** The paper mentions telephone calls and WhatsApp communication but does not elaborate on how adherence was monitored or verified.

Reviewer Comments

- **Ethical Clearance Status** The paper states that ethical approval was obtained from the Scientific Research Ethical Committee of the faculty of Nursing, Helwan University, and permission was secured from the hospital administration. This aligns with requirements, but it would be clearer if the paper explicitly states whether written informed consent was obtained from patients, which is briefly mentioned but should be emphasized.
- **Issues in the Methodology** The methodology is well-structured but lacks information about randomization processes. It is unclear whether patients were randomly assigned to the control and study groups, which affects internal validity. Further, the inclusion and exclusion criteria are not explicitly detailed, which would improve the reproducibility.
- **Typographical Mistakes** Minor typographical errors are present throughout, such as inconsistent spacing, misplaced commas, and minor spelling issues that could be easily corrected.
- **Grammar and English Language Quality** The language is generally adequate but could benefit from polishing. There are some grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that reduce clarity. For example, sentences like "The researcher started teaching lectures from 9 am to 1 pm 3 days/ week" could be rephrased for clarity.
- **Formatting Issues** The presentation of headings, subheadings, and lists could be improved for uniformity. Inconsistent use of font sizes and styles is apparent across different sections.
- **Clarity of Objectives, Results, and Conclusions** Objectives are clearly stated, but the results section could be more concise with complete statistical data presented. The conclusion appropriately summarizes the findings, but it could highlight limitations and future directions more explicitly for a balanced view.
- **Adequacy of References** References include recent and relevant sources; however, there are inconsistencies in citation formatting. Some references lack complete details or proper journal formatting.
- **Missing or Incomplete Information** Details about the randomization methodology, blinding procedures, and detailed analysis of the data are lacking. Information about the demographics of the sample, such as socioeconomic status, education level, or comorbidities, would provide valuable context.