

Manuscript: “**Long-Term Care Regulations in Ontario, Canada during COVID-19**”

**Submitted: 22 February 2021**

**Accepted: 02 July 2021**

**Published: 31 July 2021**

Corresponding Author: Elena Hunt

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n23p1

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Jestoni Dulva Maniago  
Majmaah University, Saudi Arabia

**Reviewer 2:** Blinded

**Reviewer 3:** Blinded

# ***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!***

Date Manuscript Received: 16 March 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 17 March 2021
Manuscript Title: Adequacy of Ontario Long-Term Care Regulations – COVID-19 as a case example of the need for mandated staff-patient ratios	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0314/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes/ <b>No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /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>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Must include keywords.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>This is an opinion paper.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The table presentation about the costs of Canadians' spending on healthcare must be labeled accordingly.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Be sure to use the APA citation style in your paper as suggested in the author guidelines. Check the following link:</b> <a href="https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_style_introduction.html">https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_style_introduction.html</a>	

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

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

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

Your article was well written and the pitch to policy for the improvement of the Ontario health care system specifically on safe staffing requirements is clear. I appreciate the relevance of choosing two countries with strong healthcare systems as your point of reference and COVID-19 as your case example of the need for mandated staff-patient ratios. I only suggest reducing the length of your article and structure your paper according to the ESJ's guidelines.

# *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: 11 June 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 11 June 2021
Manuscript Title: Adequacy of Ontario Long-Term Care Regulations - COVID-19 as a case example of the need for mandated staff-patient ratios	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0314/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes/No    No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Yes/No    No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Yes/No    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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The title of the article is well drafted and fully corresponds to the discussed problems, however, it is quite long and includes many dashes. I would suggest considering a shorter and truly brief title.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
The abstract is rather a summary but unfortunately it lacks any concrete outputs and results achieved by the authors. It speaks only generally about formulating policy recommendations; however, it would be desirable to mention the core points of the recommendations themselves.	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
The whole text is written in well understandable and grammatically correct English.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
The implemented methods are not so explicitly explained, nevertheless, they are clearly recognizable from the text.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
The text is drafted in a thoughtfully elaborated structure, it starts with some general introductory passages and adds specific focus on finance and budgetary issues, considerations are well supported by collected statistical evidence.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
The conclusion of the article is unfortunately too short and includes only general statements. It can be suggested to considerably improve the conclusion and build there a more solid interconnection to the body of the text.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
The article is written with reference to a wide range of high-quality sources, both research works and empirical evidence from related websites.	

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

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

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

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

It is clear that the vast majority of the text is referring to some earlier research work of other authors that is correctly cited. The article lacks more original passages drafted by the authors themselves without literature support.

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

I would suggest changing the title of the article in favour of a shorter, more apt and accurate version, and on the other hand, elaborating more about the conclusion so as to include there more original research output of the authors and their concrete recommendations how to improve the situation.