

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_130070
Title of the Manuscript:	Sociodemographic correlates of Work-related stress among child health care workers in Nigeria
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study indicates that the level of work-related stress among healthcare workers caring for children in Nigeria is higher among female workers, aged 30-39, unmarried, and engaged in secondary caregiving roles. Consequently, authorities should implement mental health support initiatives for workers in the healthcare sector in general and pediatric care in particular.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the content and scope of the manuscript. However, a more engaging and specific alternative could be: "Exploring Sociodemographic Influences on Work-Related Stress Among Child Healthcare Workers in Nigeria".	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive and provides a concise overview of the study's objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. However, it could benefit from the inclusion of specific statistical findings (e.g., exact prevalence rates or p-values) to enhance its informativeness. Additionally, the practical implications of the findings could be briefly mentioned to provide a stronger conclusion.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, with clear methodology and sound analysis. The use of Cohen's Perceived Stress Scale adds validity to the stress measurements. However, the discussion could be enriched by integrating more comparisons with similar studies from other low- and middle-income countries to contextualize the findings. The authors need to provide the approval reference number from the Ethics Committee for the conduct of this study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and include recent studies relevant to the topic. Nevertheless, the addition of studies focused on stress interventions in healthcare settings could further strengthen the discussion and recommendations.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-written and the language is suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical improvements and rephrasing in some sections could enhance readability and clarity.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Suggested Revisions for the Manuscript</p> <p>Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cronbach's Alpha: Include the Cronbach's alpha values for the reliability of the Cohen's Perceived Stress Scale used in the study. This will strengthen the validity of the instrument and the confidence in the results. 2. Hypothesis Testing: Add details about hypothesis testing, specifically tests for correlation analysis, to support the relationships explored in the study. 3. Research Procedure: Provide a clear description of the research process, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Whether the instrument was translated or adapted for the Nigerian context and details about the translation process if applicable. o Whether informed consent was obtained from participants before data collection. o The specific contexts or settings in which the survey was administered to understand the practical applicability of the tool. <p>Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Summary of Key Results: Remove the "Summary of Key Results" section, as it largely reiterates information presented in the "Results" section. Consolidating these points into the main results discussion will improve flow and avoid redundancy. <p>Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alignment of References: Ensure that the references cited in the "Discussion" section are also included in the "Introduction" to establish a coherent narrative throughout the manuscript. This will help in building a stronger rationale for the study. 2. Expand on Contextual Comparisons: Highlight more detailed comparisons between this study's findings and prior research to provide greater depth to the discussion. <p>Including graphical or tabular representations of the main findings in the discussion or conclusion could make the results more visually accessible to readers.</p> <p>Summary of Suggestions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the title for better engagement. • Enhance the abstract with specific statistics and practical implications. • Add comparisons with similar studies in the discussion. • Expand on gender-specific interventions in the recommendations. • Refine the language for improved readability. <p>Overall, this manuscript addresses an important issue and provides actionable insights, making it a valuable addition to the field of healthcare research.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i></p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Le Minh Cong</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Vietnam</p>