

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(If agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	The topic is relevant to nursing education and support needed for continued matriculation of nursing program students.	Thank you
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	The title appears appropriate	Thank you
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	The abstract is clear	Thank you
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	It is highly suggested that the author consults with a writing center or editor to assist with proofreading the manuscript.	A careful proofreading has been conducted.
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	According to APA 7th edition, the introduction should not be labelled. ***** In the introduction, the following statement implies that degrees of stress were discussed in the previous statement. There was no such discussion: 'Presentation of this level of stress can manifest in the development of depression, anxiety, and physical illnesses, especially since Covid-19 (Maqbali et al., 2023). The following statement is unclear:	The title of introduction has been removed. The beginning of the introduction has been revised to explain the impact of stress that can be experienced by nursing students.

	In this pilot study, the goal of providing SFA training was to prepare prelicensure students within a community health nursing course to build a sense of team with the knowledge of available resources and increase coping skills (Heemskerk et al., 2021). ***** Under Discussion, “Other self-care strategies discussed included journaling, mediation (did you mean meditation?) Also, the Discussion should have some reference to the literature that was presented earlier in the article. Did the findings align with the literature, was there a gap that the findings addressed? References to the literature provides a more comprehensive discussion of the results.	This statement was altered for clarification. The discussion has been revised to include these suggestions.
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	References are not consistently APA. All journal names need to be italicized (see the last two references). References also need to be formatted. If the author works in a college or university, the writing center staff can assist with formatting, as well as editing the content.	The APA-7 formatting was corrected.

PART 1: Article Title: BUILDING MENTAL READINESS: A PILOT STUDY
EVALUATING THE EFFECTS OF STRESS FIRST AID TRAINING ON PRELICENSURE
NURSING STUDENTS

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	There does not appear to be ethical issues as the author indicated approval was receive	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	Not noted	
Do you think the article is plagiarized? If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.	The article does not appear to be plagiarized	

Do you think a Disclaimer is required to explain the history of this manuscript? (As in most cases chapters of reference books are extended versions of previously published articles in some journals)	I am unable to answer this question	
---	-------------------------------------	--

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Reviewer:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write "I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer"

"I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer"

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) Guideline: Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	7-8 – needs major revisions

Specific Comments: Because the pages are not numbered (required for APA), it is challenging to state the specific page location of areas needing to be addressed.

First, thank you for allowing me to review this manuscript. This topic is a great topic that is very relevant for supporting pre-licensure nursing students. However, the content needs to flow more smoothly. Some in-text citations are not based on APA 7th edition style guide. There are incorrect or missing punctuations, spelling errors, references not formatted; pages need to be numbered - easier to identify & communicate the location of areas needing to be addressed. In Results, there was mention of Chart 1 but there was no chart. Also, the response abbreviations, e.g. SWA, SA, if they were Likert scale options, the meanings of the abbreviations should be presented in the Methods section. It is strongly recommended that another colleague proofread the manuscript as well. Do not get discouraged. It will be better with a little more work.