

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55896

Title: *Comparative Study of Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS) versus Sterile Water Injection (SWI) for Labour Analgesia in a Tertiary Care Hospital*

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: 24.01.26

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths of the Study:

- **Originality and Relevance:** The study addresses the comparative efficacy of two non-pharmacological labor analgesia techniques, TENS and SWI, which are increasingly important in resource-limited settings and align with patient-centered care.
- **Methodology:** The prospective interventional design with clearly defined groups enhances the reliability of the findings.
- **Data Collection:** Use of validated tools like the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) and maternal satisfaction scores adds robustness.
- **Sample Size:** The inclusion of 125 participants provides a reasonable sample for initial analysis.
- **Outcomes Assessed:** The study evaluates multiple relevant parameters, including pain scores, maternal satisfaction, labor duration, neonatal outcomes, and side effects.
- **Clinical Contribution:** Findings support the safety and efficacy of TENS and SWI, informing clinical practice.

Weaknesses of the Study:

- **Sample Size and Power:** Although reasonable, the sample size may still limit the detection of less common adverse events and subtle differences, especially given the small control group (n=25).
- **Blinding:** Complete blinding is not feasible due to the nature of interventions; however, potential bias due to awareness of group allocation could influence subjective outcomes.
- **Subjectivity of Pain and Satisfaction Measures:** VAS and Likert scores are inherently subjective and may be influenced by individual expectations or biases.
- **Statistical Analysis Clarity:** Details regarding specific statistical tests, confidence intervals, and effect sizes are limited, which affects interpretability.
- **Generalizability:** Single-center study limits the applicability across diverse populations.
- **Presentation Issues:** Several typographical errors and inconsistent formatting (e.g., misplaced superscripts, spacing) reduce clarity.
- **Limited Discussion on Limitations:** Although limitations are briefly mentioned, a deeper discussion on potential biases and confounders is lacking.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Reviewer Comments:

- **Title and Abstract:** The title is clear and descriptive. The abstract effectively summarizes the background, aims, methods, key findings, and conclusions but could mention the specific setting for context.
- **Introduction and Objectives:** The introduction offers a comprehensive background but could benefit from more recent references. The objectives are clearly stated.
- **Methodology and Statistical Analysis:** Methodological details are adequate; however, the description of statistical tests used should be expanded. Including effect sizes and confidence intervals would strengthen the analysis.
- **Results and Discussion:** Results are well-organized, with appropriate presentation of data. The discussion thoughtfully interprets findings but should integrate findings with existing literature more thoroughly and critically analyze limitations.
- **Conclusion and Implications:** The conclusion aligns with the results. It emphasizes the clinical relevance of TENS and SWI as non-invasive options.
- **Ethical Clearance and Consent:** The study mentions ethical approval and informed consent procedures, which adhere to ethical standards.
- **Language and Formatting:** The manuscript contains numerous grammatical and typographical errors that hinder readability. Consistent formatting of headers, tables, and references is needed.
- **Tables and Figures:** Tables are clear and informative. However, better formatting and uniform styling would improve clarity.
- **References:** The reference list is appropriate, but citation formatting should follow journal guidelines consistently.

Additional Note:

Prior Publication Check: Based on the provided content and its format, there is no immediate evidence that this exact version of the manuscript has been previously published online. However, a more thorough plagiarism or prior publication screening (via iThenticate or similar tools) should be conducted before final acceptance.