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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **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 significance of spirituality in nurses' well-being is a topic that is becoming more and more significant in nursing practice yet is sometimes overlooked. The study offers important insights into how spiritual maturity and practices may serve as protective factors for nurses, especially in light of the persistent issues of burnout, emotional exhaustion, and high attrition in healthcare systems around the world. Additionally, it places findings in the context of the Philippine healthcare system, which is especially pertinent given systemic stresses and workforce migration. This study is extremely pertinent for healthcare education academics and policymakers due to its implications for curriculum creation, leadership, and training.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Yes, the title is clear, concise, and appropriately captures the core focus of the study. It reflects both the construct under investigation (spirituality) and the outcome variables (nurses’ well-being).** |  |
| 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 generally clear and well-structured. It includes the aim, methodology, and key findings. However, the authors could consider briefly specifying the sample size (N=55) and type of analysis (chi-square test) directly in the abstract to give a fuller picture to readers at first glance.** |  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | **The manuscript demonstrates scientific validity. The technique is suitable for a descriptive-correlational study, the objectives are clearly stated, and the statistical analyses—primarily chi-square tests and Likert-scale-based ratings—are applied and interpreted appropriately. References to Maslow, Watson, Parse, and transformational leadership provide strong support for the theoretical framework and strengthen the thesis. Nevertheless, the statistical interpretation in my opinion can be further strengthened if effect sizes or other inferential measures (beyond p-values) were included. This is however, extremely time consuming so it would be a suggestion for your future endeavours.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | **In general, the references are adequate, up to date (several of them date from 2023–2024), and suitable. They contextualise the research by incorporating both local and international studies. More peer-reviewed research on spiritual evaluation instruments and targeted interventions, such as those published in the Journal of Spirituality in Clinical Practice or the Journal of Holistic Nursing, would improve the text, though.** |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **The language is mostly clear and easy to follow, though there are occasional grammatical lapses and overly long sentences. Some examples of language issues observed:**  **There are instances of redundancy, such as “extent or level,” which can be simplified for clarity. Grammatical issues also appear, including the incorrect use of singular “data” (“data was collected”) which should be “data were collected.” Some sentences are overly informal or verbose—for example, “how nurses cope and the care they provide” could be rephrased more academically as “nurses’ coping mechanisms and quality of care.” Tense usage is inconsistent, particularly in the methods and results sections. Passive voice and vague phrasing occur throughout, making some statements less direct or precise. Lastly, formatting inconsistencies, like standalone headings followed by abrupt narrative transitions, affect readability.**  **These are just suggestions to make it the best possible version but otherwise I really don’t think you need to change much. Just examples I felt where the issues mentioned were most prominent.** |  |
| Optional/General comments | **The tables are extensive and well-organized, presenting detailed data that align with the narrative interpretations. The inclusion of a proposed development plan is commendable and brings a practical application to the study. However, it would be helpful if the author(s) elaborated more on how these proposed interventions might be evaluated in future research or what implications they might hold in some detail.**  **Another suggestion I have would be regarding the keywords used in the abstract. They seem to be too broad and general and while yes, this is a fine practice but would make it harder to appear in relevant academic databases. Keywords like “nurse well-being and stress”, “Philippine clinical settings” might be better to use.**  **This manuscript is timely, relevant, and well-executed. With some minor revisions, mainly related to polishing the language and expanding the abstract/statistical reporting, it would be suitable for publication.** |  |
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