



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL  
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: **“Spirituality in Coping with Infertility Stigma: A Mixed-Methods Study”**

**Submitted: 27 April 2026**

**Accepted: 08 June 2026**

**Published: 30 June 2026**

Corresponding Author: Jocelyne Annie Houndebasso-Ahoga

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n16p79

Peer review:

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

Reviewer 2: Daniel Jambo Ghirmai  
Department of Research and Human Resource Development, Ministry of Education, Eritrea

Reviewer 3: Salma Derouiche-El Kamel  
Département of Psychology, University of Tunis, Tunisia

# ***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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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!***

Date Manuscript Received: 4.5.2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 12.5.2026
Manuscript Title: Spirituality in Coping with Infertility Stigma: A Mixed Method Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0524/26	
You agree that 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: 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]
<b>1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
The title is explicit and reflects the main focus of the study.	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>3</b>

The abstract effectively synthesizes the study's convergent mixed-methods design and integrates both quantitative and qualitative findings. However, the presentation of results becomes dense, particularly in the enumeration of coping strategy frequencies and the three-stage trajectory, which may exceed the level of detail expected at the abstract level. However, the abstract does not address the study's limitations.	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The manuscript is generally well written, with minor stylistic issues that do not affect comprehension.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
While the methodology is clearly outlined, three points warrant attention: the cross-cultural validity of the instruments in a West African context is not addressed, the addition of snowball sampling is not explicitly justified. No mention of data saturation is made for the qualitative component, though this criterion may be less central given the supplementary role of qualitative data in this convergent design.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	
Results are presented in a structured way, effectively integrating quantitative and qualitative findings. However, minor language issues should be addressed: 'antidot' should read 'antidote', and 'divert from the normative' should read 'deviate from the norms'.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
The conclusion is too brief and would benefit from staying closer to the data. Some claims extend beyond what the findings explicitly demonstrate. Minor syntactic issues should also be addressed. "Spirituality is found a substrate for coping strategies" is grammatically incorrect. Similarly, "addressed at structural level" is missing an article and should read "addressed at a structural level."	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
The references are comprehensive and appropriate to the scope of the study.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The authors are encouraged to address the following: develop the conclusion more fully, ensuring claims remain grounded in the findings; and revise several syntactic and spelling errors throughout the manuscript. The abstract would also benefit from a more concise presentation of results.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# 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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: Dnipro Academy of Continuing Education, Ukraine	
Date Manuscript Received: 15.05.2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 21.05.2026
Manuscript Title: <b>Spirituality in Coping with Infertility Stigma: A Mixed Method Study</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 4	
You agree that 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]
------------------	--

<b>1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
The title is highly clear, descriptive, and adequate for the manuscript's content.	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<p>The abstract is well-structured and contains all mandatory elements of a scientific summary.</p> <p>There are some recommendations to make the text sound more scientific:</p> <p>This convergent mixed-methods study examined <b>the role of</b> spirituality in coping with infertility-related stigma among 384 women attending evangelical churches in Zou County, Benin Republic.</p> <p>Quantitative data analysis was <b>conducted using</b> SPSS version 25.0, and a matched mixed-method approach was used for the qualitative data analysis.</p> <p><b>Results indicated</b> that the Spiritual Transcendence scale was dominated by the Prayer Fulfillment subscale, and <b>the</b> integration of qualitative findings confirmed a prayer-centered spirituality among <b>the</b> surveyed women.</p> <p>“In terms of results” better replace to “Results indicated that”</p> <p>Regarding spirituality in coping with infertility stigma, Spiritual Transcendence significantly predicted coping strategies, accounting for 20.3% of <b>the</b> variance.</p>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p> <p>Better to make more scientific style:</p> <p>In the original: “The active-avoidance strategy was the least scoring, and the active-confronting the most”.</p> <p>Proposed variant: “Active-confronting emerged as the most frequently utilized coping mechanism, whereas active-avoidance was the least prevalent among the surveyed participants”.</p> <p><i>“In terms of results, about spirituality...” sounds like more spoken style</i></p> <p>The analysis of spiritual profiles indicated that...</p> <p>or</p> <p>Regarding the <i>spirituality</i>...</p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>

<p>The methodology section is rigorous, transparent, and represents one of the strongest components of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p>
<p>The presentation of results is detailed, comprehensively using the quantitative and qualitative outcomes across both main variables, i.e. Spirituality and Coping Strategies.</p> <p>However, there are a few technical mistakes and data misunderstanding.</p> <p>P.77. Internal consistency varied from unacceptable for Religious Involvement (<math>\alpha = 0.42</math>) to excellent with Spiritual Transcendence (<math>\alpha = 0.90</math>). The findings in this study divert from the normative on the Religious Sentiments scales.</p> <p>In psychometric standards, an alpha below 0.60 is considered unacceptable and indicates low internal consistency, which means that the items in this subscale did not reliably measure the same construct among the participants in Benin.</p> <p>The author should explain it as a severe structural limitation or interpret <i>why</i> it failed culturally.</p> <p>It seems that the values in the columns under "Developer's Normative Data (N = 2,989)" are completely broken and shifted horizontally for the <i>Religious Involvement</i> and <i>Religious Crisis</i> rows.</p> <p>Check the last two rows in the table.</p>	
<p><b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b></p>	<p><b>5</b></p>
<p>The conclusions are concise, accurate, and tightly tied to the empirical findings of the study.</p>	
<p><b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p>
<p>Recommendations for Resubmission:</p> <p>The reference list is scientifically valid and relevant, but the author do a thorough clean-up of all DOI URLs, correct the capitalizations of paper titles.</p> <p>Make a systematic line-by-line verification of the bibliography to clean up the URL strings, correct sentence-case typography in article titles, and ensure all active hyperlinks route directly to the source text.</p> <p>E.g. Broken or Incomplete DOI/URL Links</p> <p>Ref. 7, 27, 38</p> <p>Ref. 45 It probably should be <b>March 31</b>.</p>	

Naab, F., van der Wath, A. E., Kyei, J. M. & Armah, D. (2025, Marsh 31). Spirituality as a coping strategy for infertility: A scoping review. *Journal of Religion & Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-025-02302-w>

Inconsistent Title Capitalization

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The submission is highly relevant, strong and provides profound social utility. Once these data formatting issues and psychometric nuances are polished, this paper will make an excellent addition to the journal.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ***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. Daniel Jambo Ghirmai	
University, Country: Eritrea	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/05/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 18/05/2026
Manuscript Title: Spirituality in Coping with Infertility Stigma: A Mixed Method Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 04.24.05.2026	
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.

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
-------------------------	--

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The title is so clear and adequate to the content of the study)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The abstract is clearly presents the purpose, the methods and findings of the study)</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Although the paper is correctly documented, there are few spelling errors)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The researchers clearly stated the study research design, research procedures, instruments and data analysis)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The results do not contain errors, but needs additional tables for correlation and regression results)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The conclusion and implication of the study is well articulated and documented)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The references are up to date, and comprehensive, but there is a need to add new references specially in the discussion part)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

## **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This is potentially an interesting article but would need minor revisions to meet journal standards. The following points would need to be addressed: -

1. Although the problem of the statement of the study well presented in 2<sup>nd</sup> page, paragraph two, there is a need to add the research questions or objectives, and the significance of the study in a separate section.
2. There is absence of ethical clearance in the manuscript specially declaration statement of AI usage, so that the researchers have to properly address the issue.
3. The paper is correctly documented, however, there are few spelling and grammatical errors
4. There is no consistency in the formatting of the paper which needs further attention. E.g. the paragraphs of the literature review are not justified.
5. In the result section the authors have mentioned that the findings of correlation among the variables. Nevertheless, the paper did not provide the correlation results in a tabular form with the confidence interval of the correlations and Bootstrapping? In examining effects, the authors have to use Bootstrapping procedure.
6. In the discussion part the authors used very few and old references. Therefore, they should add adequate references.

## **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**