

Manuscript: “Nursing And Midwifery Students’ Lived Experiences Of Faculty Caring And Uncaring Behaviours On Their Learning: A Phenomenology Study”

Submitted: 14 November 2020

Accepted: 25 December 2020

Published: 31 January 2020

Corresponding Author: Dr. Mep Chipeta

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n3p205

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Etim John John,
,Department of Public Health, University of Calabar, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Dr. Sheena Ramazanu,
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

| | |
|--|--|
| Reviewer Name: | Email: |
| University/Country: | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 2020-11-06 | Date Review Report Submitted: 2020-11-07 |
| Manuscript Title: Impact of faculty caring and uncaring behaviours on nurse-midwife students' learning: A phenomenological study | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 115.11.2020 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes | |

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

| <i>Questions</i> | <i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|---|--|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 3 |
| <i>The title should be organized in phenomenological manner, without "impact" and with the focus on the core research phenomena through actual phenomenological dimensions.</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 5 |
| | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 2 |
| <i>Methodological part must be improved. `Sampling, data collection and Data analysis as well as the Phenomenological version and the argumentation to use it in this research should be provided. Info about participants must be provided in more detailed and the ethics should be explained more explicitly.</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 2 |
| <i>Findings are provided in factological, not phenomenological manner; themes are formed as very hard, not contextualized. Please revise and improve. With every extract from interview should be provided the code of the research participant.</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 3 |
| <i>Discussion should be focused on phenomenological dimensions and the findings, but not only on comparisons with other authors. Conclusions are recommended to improve - they should be not country related, but phenomenology and the research issue related.</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | X |
| Reject | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Additionally: please revise the abstract, when the manuscript will be improved.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

| | |
|--|---|
| Reviewer Name: ETIM, JOHN JOHN. | Email: |
| University/Country: Department of Public Health, University of Calabar, Nigeria. | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 6th Nov., 2020. | Date Review Report Submitted: 8th Nov., 2020. |
| Manuscript Title: Impact of faculty caring and uncaring behaviours on nurse-midwife students' learning: A phenomenological study. | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 11115/20 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes | |

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

| <i>Questions</i> | <i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|---|---|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 3 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| <p>a. Title not too clear.</p> <p>b. Consider recasting the title to reflect the study.</p> <p>Suggested title: Influence of teachers caring and uncaring behaviour on nurse-midwife students: A phenomenological study.</p> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and | 4 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| results. | |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| Good abstract | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| But still read through to ensure no errors. | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 2 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The study design was not properly explained. b. From what population (How many) was the sample 10 derived? c. How many students were from year 3 and how many from year 4? d. What interview guide was used and what were the probing questions used? | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| Results are presented qualitatively correct. | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| Fair | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 3 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. References are arranged properly according to APA referencing style. b. There are too many citations/references that are too old (older than 10years). References from 2010-2020 are encouraged c. When authors are cited for the first time, all the names should be used then use et al in subsequent citations. | |

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | X |
| Reject | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The comments and suggestions should be followed and then be resubmitted for consideration for publication

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

| | |
|--|---|
| Reviewer Name: Dr. Sheena Ramazanu | Email: |
| University/Country: The Hong Kong Polytechnic University | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 7/11/2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: 9/11/2020 |
| Manuscript Title: Impact of faculty caring and uncaring behaviours on nurse-midwife students' learning: A phenomenological study | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 11115/20 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No | |

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

| <i>Questions</i> | <i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|---|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 3 |
| <p>Original title: Impact of faculty caring and uncaring behaviours on nurse-midwife students' learning: A phenomenological study</p> <p>Comment: The word 'impact' could be replaced with experiences throughout the manuscript. Phenomenological study often explores the experiences of the identified phenomena.</p> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and | 4 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| results. | |
| - | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <p>1. Page 3, line 13, (Gillespie)- intext referencing is incomplete as no year is indicated</p> <p>2. Page 4, lines 10-13- Literature also supports that if nursing students are cared for, they also learn the ability to care for their patients and have a sense of growth and change (Begum & Slavin, 2012; Nodding, 2005; Murphy et al., 2009).; they develop a sense of self-awareness (Brown, 2011)</p> <p>Comment: they develop a sense of self-awareness for? To re-write this statement</p> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 3 |
| <p>1. To insert both intext and end-text references for Husserl’s philosophical approach.</p> <p>2. For data analysis- add aspects on how did you ensure methodological rigor- dependability, transferability, credibility</p> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | X |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |
| Reject | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is a very insightful manuscript that underpins caring versus uncaring attitudes of faculty staff and how it influences students learning outcomes. The need and the importance of the study is clearly articulated. I have listed some minor revisions for your kind considerations.