

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review report. 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 review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend 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: 21.04.18	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 09.05.18
Manuscript Title: <i>Patients' perceptions of health information given by nurses and clinicians at discharge at Chiradzulu District Hospital in Malawi, sub-Saharan Africa</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0505/18	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>  <i>Has more words, the last part, sub-Saharan Africa can be removed</i>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Title and abstract not corresponding, the abstract has included nurses, clinicians' perceptions in the aim, and even guardians as participants, it could have been better if focus was on one group.</i></li> <li>• <i>Separate the research design and data collection approach, it is not specified</i></li> <li>• <i>The conclusion is a summary of the findings, revisit this part to include recommendations</i></li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>  <i>There are some errors in spelling and tense in some areas of the manuscript. Refer to the document with track changes.</i>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Need to indicated whether data saturation was achieved for this study or sample size was</i></li> </ul>	<b>2</b>

<i>solely achieved based on recommendations from other authors as indicated by the author</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Need to indicate how long was each interview with the participants</i></li> <li>• <i>Still methodology includes other participants other than patients without giving reasons why they were included in the study.</i></li> <li>• <i>Author should indicated into which language was the translation done.</i></li> </ul>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The content in the body is not well organized. There is more information presented without following the guidelines for presenting qualitative data i.e. no themes categorized. As a result, it is difficult for the reader to follow the article.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>There is a need to add more on the recommendations. Only one recommendation has been made</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>APA recommends indenting of second line.. which has not been done</i> <i>No numbering of items in the reference list</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>X</b>
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The paper is informative to nursing practice in Malawi, as issues of patients and health education at discharge is overlooked yet it is an important area for quality health care.

However, the information presented in this manuscript is difficulty to follow because of a mix of issues. The author should revisit the manuscript to follow guidelines for presenting qualitative data for publication

There is a need to identify themes in the data for easy follow up by the readers.

Author should choose, whether to present findings for patients’ and guardians perception only, other than combining with healthcare providers.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**European Scientific Journal**  
European Scientific Institute

