

Manuscript: “**Effectiveness of Teaching Program on Critical Care Nurses’ Performance during Endotracheal Suctioning in the Intensive Care Units in Syria**”

Submitted: 14 July 2021

Accepted: 23 August 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Yaser Adnan Abo Jeesh

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p190

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Elena Dobrica, Hawaii

Reviewer 3: Franca Daniele, Italy

Reviewer 4: Dr. N. K. Rathee, United States

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!

Date Manuscript Received: July, 19	Date Review Report Submitted: July, 27
Manuscript Title: Effectiveness of Teaching Program on Nurses' Performance during Endotracheal Suctioning in the Critical Care Units in Syria.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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
The title is according to the study described, being clear enough to express what is pursued in the study	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
The abstract needs improvements in terms of English and sentence expression. Some sentences are too long, thus losing the information that is to be presented. The abstract as a whole is far too long compared to the information it provides. I recommend shortening it, with an emphasis on the sections of materials and methods and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling	4

mistakes in this article.	
I recommend correcting grammar and spelling errors in the text, which would improve the quality and fluency of reading.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
The study methods are poorly explained, it is not specified and described exactly and in detail how the study is conducted. The chronological stages of the study are only listed, without describing each stage separately. The pilot study conducted on the 5 nurses is only mentioned, without saying (at least a few lines would be recommended) what it entails. It would be interesting to mention what the 8-hour workshop entails - how many hours of hands-on activity, how many hours of effective teaching, the break-study alternation. The stages of the study are not otherwise explained in detail in either the pilot study or the large study. The limitations of the study and how they could be prevented or resolved are not mentioned.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results section is well written and complete. However, I recommend entering at least some data for some charts to make it easier to track the results.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions are well written, to the point, accompanied by useful recommendations in the medical practice of ICU staff, regardless of the hospital in which they work. I recommend small corrections to improve written English.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references are appropriate to the study and discussions, covering both articles published in recent years and older ones. I also recommend adding some references to articles published during the COVID-19 pandemic, the intubation and suctioning maneuvers being intensely used during this period.	

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):

Congratulations to the authors for the study. The study is generally well organized and written, with the emphasis on the methods section which is very poorly described. I also recommend the introduction of diagrams that allow easy reading of the tables from the results. Small corrections in English are needed to increase the fluency of the text.

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: Franca Daniele	
University/Country: Italy	
Date Manuscript Received: August 3, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: August 4, 2021
Manuscript Title: Effectiveness of Teaching Program on Nurses' Performance	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0767/21	
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: 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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>The paper needs thorough editorial, language and grammatical revision</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The quasi-experimental method should be explained or bibliographical references should be provided.</i> <i>The educational program used should be extensively reported.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The authors should explain which steps were more frequently carried out in the wrong way or not carried out at all, and the possible reasons for it.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusions should report on the strength and weakness points of the educational program</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>The references should be carefully revised both in the Reference Section and in the text</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The study is very interesting since it explores the performance of an educational program delivered to nurses working in ICU settings. The study addresses the serious problem of execution and complications of suctioning of endotracheal apparatuses, and provides precious information on how to improve the procedure.

The sections before the Methods and the Conclusion section contain many repetitions. I suggest to reduce the content.

The quasi-experimental method should be explained or references should be provided. More details should be given concerning which steps were more mis-conducted and why.

The paper regards the performance of the educational program, so the program should be reported in detail.

The results before the program and after the program should be explained in detail.

The possible strength and weakness points of the program should be highlighted.

The manuscript needs thorough editorial, language and grammar revision.

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. N. K. Rathee	
University/Country: United States	
Date Manuscript Received: August 3, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: Aug. 4, 2021
Manuscript Title: Effectiveness of Teaching Program on Nurses' Performance during Endotracheal Suctioning in the Critical Care Units in Syria.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0767/21	
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: 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 quite clear and connects with the objectives of the study.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>Yes, I has the required information.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Yes, there are few grammatical errors (some of the comments have been posted in the attached manuscript). It will be better to get it edited professionally.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Yes, the methodology is self-explanatory.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Yes, the results are very clear.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The study has been concluded well.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Yes, the references have been provided.</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):

Recommended for publication after editing by a professional editor.