



Paper: “A Comparative Study on Effective Clinical Instruction: The Millennial Generation’s Perspective”

Corresponding Author: Dr. Charito Indonto

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n21p338

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Audrey Tolouian, UTEP USA

Published: 31.07.2020

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: July 10, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: July 13, 2020
Manuscript Title: A Comparative Study on Effective Clinical Instruction: The Millennial Generation's Perspective	
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.	4
The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article. Indeed, elements of the title were complete.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract is logically presented.	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are negligible grammatical errors and spelling.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review this paper titled, “A Comparative Study on Effective Clinical Instruction: The Millennial Generation’s Perspective”. With most studies focusing on characteristics of what effective teachers would be, very few authors have undertaken a quantitative study. This reason supports justification for the study.

The article seemed very logical and rigorous. I believe that giving an opportunity to publish this can contribute not only to the literature but also on the part of the teachers. Thus, suggesting for acceptance for publication. What follows are suggestions for improving the manuscript.

1. There is no uniformity of the term used. The authors need to decide which term they will use, is it nursing instructor, clinical instructor or just instructor.
2. The authors mentioned, “The inclusion criteria were sent to students who enrolled in the classroom and clinical courses if they wished to voluntarily participate in the study. What do they mean “sent to the students”? Kindly rephrase, as it is confusing to the readers.
3. Under the participants, can the authors describe further, who these 100 participants are?
4. In Table 1 demographic profile, what do the authors mean about number of exposure? Exposure where to whom? Please clarify on this.

Once again, thank you very much for the confidence in letting me review this paper.

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	Email:
University/Country: UTEP USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 7/15/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 7/20/2020
Manuscript Title: A Comparative Study on Effective Clinical Instruction: The Millennial Generation's Perspective	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0770/20	
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.	4.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, though the conclusion can be better developed.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	5

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> yes	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are a fair number of errors- please see track changes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> yes	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Please see track changes	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes- but conclusion can be better developed The title suggests that there is something new to learn about Millennials- I think you could add more about this group into the paper and develop that a bit more- why is this important information, this is a great topic- just needs more development?	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>References can be updated- as it does not appear 80% are within the last 5 years</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):

Please see paper for suggestions

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: