

	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	Yes – this is a unique program and targeted a great need in pre-licensure nursing education.	Thank you
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	I feel that since you're including MSN students in the article, the title needs work. Please see my notes regarding sampling.	These are all prelicensure students – we have a unique program for non-nurses with other degrees.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Needs additional description as to why prelicensure nursing students (BSN) and MSN students were the sample. MSN students are not referred to as prelicensure in the literature since they are already licensed.	We have added clarification that the MSN students are prelicensure students.
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes.	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	Please address the following: 1. The introduction would benefit from a discussion regarding the role of stress in nursing – consider eustress vs. distress or facilitating vs debilitating anxiety. 2. Paragraph 2, sentence 2 of Intro: after “professional stress” add	1 The introduction has been revised to reflect these comments. 2 Hughes et al. (2021) underscores the need for creating a nursing workforce capable of dealing with professional stress as a means to reduce burnout and improve nursing retention,

	the words “is needed” or something similar. 3. Materials & Methods section – I prefer paragraph format for this section but go with the journal preference. 4. Additional description is needed about participants – for example, what year were the BSN students? How do the MSN students fit in? See comment above regarding the use of “prelicensure” as a descriptor. 5. Results – could this data be put in a table and referenced in the narrative?	suggesting it begins in the pre-licensure educational setting. 3. 4. Additional description provided in revision. We have prelicensure MSN students, those who have a degree in another specialty and are just entering nursing. 5 There is a chart that was attached, which we will place in the body of the manuscript.
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	Yes they are fine.	

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?	Did all participants complete an informed consent? Yes 1. 2. You mention not collecting demographic data to protect confidentiality but there are other ways to protect participants. Demographic data	This is a consideration for the future, as no demographic data was collected for this pilot study.

	would provide the reader with additional information.	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	None identified.	
Do you think the article is plagiarized? If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.	None identified.	
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)	If this is a secondary publication of the project then yes.	This is a primary publication

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

Specific Comments: See details outlined above. If informed consent was not obtained, it should not be published as this is a study rigor issue – as well as an ethical issue.

Authors also need to clarify the BSN and MSN students choices as participants. They mention that need for the SFA to assist practicing nurses (presumably new ones) in coping with the stressors of the workplace. Findings and Discussion do not extend to this goal – focus is on prelicensure BSN students.