

Manuscript: “**The Relationship Between Apache Ii Score And Nurses’ Occupational Stress In Icu**”

Submitted: 18 March 2021

Accepted: 06 July 2021

Published: 31 August 2021

Corresponding Author: Noreena Yi-Chin Liu

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n29p19

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Elena Hunt
Laurentian University, Canada

Reviewer 2: Audrey Tolouian
UTEP, USA

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.
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: Elena Hunt	
University/Country: Laurentian University, Canada	
Date Manuscript Received: April 4, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: April 9, 2021
Manuscript Title: The relationship between APACHE II score and Nurses Occupational Stress in ICU	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0403-21	
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: No	

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>Excellent title</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2

<i>Abstract content is adequate but poorly expressed and with grammatical errors. The form diminishes the essence.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>Lack of clarity results mainly from poor written expression and grammar, repetitions, incongruences, writing style, unfinished sentences, variables/concepts introduced late and not previously reviewed, unreferenced passages, medical care and nursing care interchangeably used and confused, poor argumentation and interrupted text.</i> <i>The notion of Experiment is used to express Aim/Objective of study/Analysis or Instrument/Scale, in this Cross sectional descriptive-correlational design.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Method seems sounds but poorly explained, especially around data collection using APACHE II. Lack of logical scientific flow and deduction/induction.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Results related to an unmentioned/undefined objective appear suddenly in this section. It looks like a new hypothesis was tested (a correlation between stress and patient health outcomes). If this speaks to a dimension of a scale, it is poorly explained, therefore unclear.</i> <i>Again, the notion of Experiment comes up in Results, with a different meaning than in Method. Lack of coherence. Inconsistent and unexplained abbreviations throughout.</i> <i>Results of the regression analysis are insufficiently explained.</i> <i>Statistical analysis and presentation of results are technically correct.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>Summary and conclusions are stretched, many advances are unjustified by results, never compared with previous studies.</i> <i>These sections iterate more recommendations and less of a discussion.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Most times the references are mentioned, not always.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	x

Reject	x
--------	---

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Your work is relevant, important and timely. It must be correctly expressed and illustrated. Scientific flow should be insured. Please, have your text language proofed by a native English speaker/researcher/academic before resubmission. Thank you!

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.
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: Audrey Tolouian	
University/Country: UTEP USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 4/14/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN APACHE II SCORE AND NURSES' OCCUPATIONAL STRESS IN ICU	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ISSN: 1857 - 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857- 7431	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	

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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The Apache is only one of the items used, maybe also mentions the NOSS	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The paper needs a little edit	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>You do a nice job of explaining the NOSS, please help explain the APACHE so the reader knows what it evaluates.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) Also- the conclusion (#1-7) are not mentioned in the rest of the paper- maybe talk about those factors in the body of the paper and explain how those conclusions were arrived at.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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):

This study is important to the moral distress that nurses are feeling right now- good timing.