
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: 19 June 2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 25 June 2018
Manuscript Title: MOVILIZACIÓN TEMPRANA COMO PREVENCIÓN Y TRATAMIENTO PARA LA DEBILIDAD ADQUIRIDA EN LA UNIDAD DE CUIDADOS INTENSIVOS EN PACIENTES EN VENTILACIÓN MECÁNICA. EXPERIENCIA EN UNA UCI DE ATENCIÓN PÚBLICA EN MÉXICO.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The title it is clear but it needs to unify if it is in the ICU public health care as a general term or specified in "Hospital General San Juan del Río de la Secretaria de Salud".	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract presents introduction, objects, methods, results and conclusions. It exceeds little bit the maximum of words (250) for this section. The introduction is longer than the rest of the sections, I would recommend to reduce this section. In the section of conclusions at Spanish version is missing the last sentence that it is specify at English version, which needs correcting of a minor grammar mistakes, for example as a connectors with the last sentence in this English version.	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
There are some minor mistakes at grammar, spaces in some words as I assume is a matter of typing mistakes during the process and an important lack of connectors (for example: in the results section of the article).	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<p>1. - As it has mentioned before (section 1), it needs to unify if it is speaking about general public health or specifying the hospital.</p> <p>2. - The inclusion, exclusion and elimination criteria are clear but it is not specifying at this section the final sample of patients even if it is a convenience.</p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<p>In results section: The way to start this section has a lack of connectors, as a recommendation, I will suggest specifying the results by sections.</p> <p>In the discussion section: There is no comparison between the results of this study and previous studies. Speaks more about other authors and what was done in other studies at the introduction section.</p> <p>In the section of annexes: There is not necessary to add the ICU Mobility Scale, Barthel index, muscular evaluation and the pictures of the technics.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<p>The conclusion and summary are precise and supportive with the obtained results of this study. However it is necessary to correct the minor mistakes in each section of the article that were mentioned previously.</p> <p>Finally at the conclusion is better to speak about the necessity to implement the physiotherapy in these types of patients to reduce the recovering time and their stay at ICU rather than a recommendation.</p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	5
<p>The references are according to APA citation style, in total 14 citations, but I would recommend to add more citations, due to this work would be strengthened and have more support with the points of views by previous studies. These studies can be found in databases.</p>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

There are some issues to improve in this manuscript:

1. There is no unifying with the title and methods about where it was performance this study (the ICU public health care as a general term or specified in "Hospital General San Juan del Río de la Secretaria de Salud").
2. On page 2, in the conclusion from the abstract is different form the Spanish version (a sentence is

missing), take care the maximum of word for the abstract 250, in both versions is more than that amount and try to simplified the introduction section from the abstracts and from the article.

3. - The introduction section has been more development than the rest of the sections of the article.

4. - At the result section has a lack of the connectors, it is not specified the total number of the patients (in this section). Moreover it is not necessary to explain in which consist the ICU Mobility Scale or the Barthel index, there are well known. Besides that it is not necessary to include at the annexes the ICU Mobility Scale, Barthel index, muscular evaluation or the pictures of the technics. The most important are the graphics and the tables with the main results of your study.

5. - The discussion section is very important to have comparison between the results of this study and previous studies. At the introduction section of this work speaks more about other authors and what was done in other studies rather than the discussion. I would recommend to add more citations, due to this work would be strengthened and have more support with the points of views by previous studies

6. - At the conclusion section is better to speak about the necessity to implement the physiotherapy in these types of patients to reduce the recovering time and their stay at ICU rather than a recommendation.

Once these changes are addressed, the article should be ready to published.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The topic is timely and will be of interest to the readers of the journal. However, the manuscript has some vulnerable sections that can be improve. The review of the literature is not enough and the discussion is insufficiently targeted yet, so the reader is not given a full background about the topic.

