

Manuscript: “The Effect Of An Educational Program On Nurses’ Practices Regarding The Implementation Of Patient Care And Safety Measures During Nasogastric Tube Feeding In The Critical Care Units In Syria”

Submitted: 14 July 2021

Accepted: 09 August 2021

Published: 31 August 2021

Corresponding Author: Yaser Adnan Abo Jeesh

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n29p59

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Reda Abd Elaal Thabet

Al-Ghad International Colleges for Applied Medical Sciences, KSA

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Audrey Tolouian

UTEP, USA

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Dr. Reda Abd Elaal Thabet	
University/Country: Al-Ghad International Colleges for Applied Medical Sciences/ KSA	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/7/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 18/7/2021
Manuscript Title: The Effect of an Educational Program on Nurses' Practices Regarding the Implementation of Patient Care and Safety Measures during Nasogastric Tube Feeding in the Critical Care Units in Syria.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 68.07.2021	
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.

<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>The title is clear and adequate to the content</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Conclusions in the abstract could be more comprehensive</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The manuscript is free of grammar and spelling mistakes. The punctuation marks could be considered</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The research methods are explained pretty well.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are clear.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are comprehensive and is really adequate to the research.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are comprehensive and match the APA style.</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):

- The conclusions section in the abstract should be more comprehensive.
- Some of the punctuation marks could be considered and rearranged.

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: August 3, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: August 4, 2021
Manuscript Title: The Effect of an Educational Program on Nurses' Practices Regarding the Implementation of Patient Care and Safety Measures during Nasogastric Tube Feeding in the Critical Care Units in Syria.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---68.07.2021---f	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: 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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)Yes- but needs a major edit for grammar</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are many grammar issues with the paper- The topic is good and had interesting results, as it was an interesting topic- but needs a good edit	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>yes</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>yes</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>It would be interesting to see what the nurse's thoughts were on their not following the protocol in the start-not enough time, too many patients etc...were pt outcomes increased?</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):