



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_28297
Title of the Manuscript:	The effectiveness of reality therapy concepts on self-esteem of the elderly people in the mental health center of Aramesh in Parsabad
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript titled “The effectiveness of reality therapy concepts on self-esteem of the elderly people in the mental health center of Aramesh in Parsabad” studied the efficacy of the reality therapy for the elder persons. As authors are mentioned, the increasing of elder population is big issue common to the world, so author's intervention is very interesting and may be useful. However, there are many issues that authors have to correct. Some of them are critical because they are concerning the design of this study. 1. The definition of subjects is unclear. Authors intervened to “healthy” elder people? If so, why they are recruited from Aramesh mental health center? If healthy people's medical records are kept in the center for some reason (e.g. mental health check up), authors should state it. 2. Lack of demographic data is critical issue as well as the subject definition. Authors only provided mean age. To state two groups are equal, other demographic data (existence of past mental disease history, marital status, cognitive status, single person or not, having job or not, race, ethnic group, overall education years) are essential with appropriate statistic comparing. 3. Authors MUST write the ethical statements, such as the approval from ethical committee, conflict of interest, and sources of funding.	The effectiveness of reality therapy concepts on self-esteem of the elderly in the in Parsabad no existence mental disease history, no job, similiary ethnic group of elderly.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	4. T-tests are not appropriate for such a small sample size. Use non-parametric test to compare two groups as long as normal distribution is not confirmed. 5. All tables should be revised. For example, I can't catch the author's intend of table 4. 6. Authors analyzed with "Two-way repeated measures analysis of variance". So, clarify the results, both of "between subjects" and multiple comparison with using graph. 7. Please provide the detail of the reality therapy. I can't find out this therapy is a personal therapy or group therapy or combination of multiple intervention methods like psychoeducational therapy and cognitive behavioral therapy, or personal counseling. 8. I checked first five citations by Pubmed and Google scholar. None of them was hit. I'm not sure but aren't they local language papers? If its so, please replace them with English papers we can check so that readers can cite properly. 9. Fuzziness of the subject definition is affecting the conclusion. Did authors intervened "healthy, non-cognitive impairment" elder people? Since the definitions of sample are fuzzy, I can't make sense the interpretation from this result are correct for this conclusion. Authors seemingly say the effectiveness of reality therapy can apply for most of people, but I don't think so. Author's results are showing only the improvement of Rosenberg self-esteem questionnaire score after the intervention. Authors should conclude within the interpretation from the result, and must mention the limitation of this study. Ethical approval: Yes, authors require the description	approval from ethical committee welfare social organization. Table 3: mean and standard deviation in three times measures among intervention and contro l group. As it is observed in table 4, the null hypothesis is rejected and contrary hypothesis is accepted. Graph for between subjects and multiple comparison no sufficient. Several studies have shown the effectiveness of reality therapy on a variety of components, problems and psychological disorders such as adult depression. I checked all citation by google scholar. For example: The effectiveness of the concepts of reality therapy training on happiness of the elderly men of Ardabil. Or Investigation of the effectiveness of reality therapy in a group method on increasing self-esteem of students of Ferdowsi university of Mashhad. No limitation of this study. approval from ethical committee welfare social
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of ethics committee approval and informed consent.	organization.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	10. In the legend of table 5, authors wrote, "null hypothesis". Authors should state what is the "null hypothesis" in the body/legend, or remove/paraphrase it. 11. I couldn't understand the legend of table 3. Without p-value, why authors recognized there was a significant (or non significant) difference? Authors also should use "0.5" instead of ".5", "significant" instead of "sig."	It removed paraphrased. p-value describe in abstract.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Inappropriate definition of subject, insufficient demographic data, inadequate statistic analysis, Non-English citations, too much conclusion, lack of ethical description	