



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



**Paper: “The Role of Resilience in Managing the Psychological Effects of Infertility Stigma:
A Mixed-Methods Study”**

Submitted: 13 April 2026

Accepted: 19 May 2026

Published: 31 May 2026

Corresponding Author: Jocelyne Annie Houndebasso-Ahoga

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2026.v22n13p97](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2026.v22n13p97)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Olena Kovalchuk
Dnipro Academy of Continuing Education, Ukraine

Reviewer 2: Raul Rocha Romero
Autonomous National University of Mexico, Mexico

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Olena Kovalchuk	
University, Country: University/Country: Dnipro Academy of Continuing Education, Ukraine	
Date Manuscript Received: 15.04.2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 19.04.2026
Manuscript Title: The Role of Resilience in Managing the Psychological Effects of Infertility Stigma: A Mixed-Methods Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0471/26	
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.	5
The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. The title accurately reflects the core variables (resilience, infertility stigma, psychological effects) and the specific methodology (mixed-methods) used in the study.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
The abstract is well-structured. It clearly states the objective, details the mixed-methods design and sample size (384 women, 45 leaders), and summarizes key findings regarding stigma accounting for 45% of psychological variance.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<p>The academic tone is appropriate and professional. However, there is a minor typo in the references section. For example,</p> <p>75. Yan, M., Zhang, L., Qin, D., Zhou, Z., Wum Y., Hou, N. & Tao, X. (2024b). Examining the effects of psychological resilience and wellbeing on perceived stress and depressive symptoms among undergraduate nursing interns: Testing a moderated mediation model. <i>Frontiers in Public Health</i>, 12, 1497076. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1497076</p> <p>https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1497076/full</p> <p>Please double-check the spelling of all authors in the bibliography (e.g., verifying "Wum Y." vs "Wu Y.") to ensure citation accuracy.</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The convergent mixed-methods design is thoroughly explained. The author provides a detailed breakdown of the three-stage sampling procedure, the standardized quantitative tools used (CD-RISC-10, ISS-SF, DASS-21), and the qualitative thematic analysis framework	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
Results are presented logically, integrating both quantitative statistics and qualitative themes. The use of joint displays to compare patterns effectively strengthens the findings.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions logically follow the data. The distinction that resilience acts as an independent protective factor rather than a buffer for stigma is a significant and well-supported insight.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5

The manuscript cites a wide range of relevant and recent literature (2021–2025), alongside foundational works like Goffman (1963), providing a solid theoretical framework.

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):

Please double-check the spelling of all authors in the bibliography (e.g., verifying "Wum Y." vs "Wu Y.") to ensure citation accuracy.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper is well written, well-structured and clear. I recommend this paper for publication.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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. Raúl Rocha Romero	
University, Country: UNAM. México	
Date Manuscript Received: 16-04-2026	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: The Role of Resilience in Managing the Psychological Effects of Infertility Stigma: A Mixed-Methods Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 27	
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:	
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.	5
<i>The title is very accurate.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
<i>The abstract is very comprehensive.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The text is very well written.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The text is very well written.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are very well presented. They are clear and concise.</i>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion is brief, but it is preceded by a very good discussion. The points are presented in an orderly and coherent manner.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>The reference list is very comprehensive. A thorough literature review was conducted. Just check that all cited authors are in References and vice versa.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is very comprehensive, contrasts what exists in the specialized literature and, in addition, is its own empirical study.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: