

Paper: “Perfil Epidemiológico del Personal de Enfermería del Hospital General de Querétaro Positivo a Covid-19”

Submitted: 14 July 2022

Accepted: 25 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Karla Gudiño

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p343](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p343)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jairo Mariel Cardenas
University of San Luis Potosi, Mexico

Reviewer 2: Pilar Alejandra Caudillo Adriano
México

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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:26/07/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/08/2022
Manuscript Title: The epidemiological profile of the nursing personnel of the Queretaro's General Hospital that were positive to Covid-19	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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>The title in English is adequate and clear, the title in Spanish need a review for it to have the same idea of the english one.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>They are clear nevertheless I suggest to highlight them and to change the title of objectives to objective because it's only one.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>There aren't.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>They are clear.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The paper doesn't have results</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>I suggest to reviewing the conclusion so that it responds to the objective</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>They are clear</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):

In the discussion, I suggest placing the total number of infected nurses in the universe of study presented and not placing the total number of hospital personnel to avoid confusion, that is, placing the number of infections with reference to the 185 in the sample.

To review the conclusion to respond to the objective.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Jairo Mariel Cardenas	
University/Country: University of San Luis Potosi, Mexico	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/07/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/08/2022
Manuscript Title: The epidemiological profile of the nursing personnel of the Queretaro's General Hospital that were positive to Covid-19	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 50.07.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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 paper describes the epidemiological profile of the nursing staff at a COVID-positive hospital and presents consistency in each of the parts of the article (introduction, methods, results, discussion, conclusions, and references) with respect to the title.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The summary describes in a concrete and precise way the points that may be relevant to the specialized audience in the area and the objectives, methods and results are identified.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Some double or triple spaces are identified, as well as the absence of these in different parts of the writing, which results in the corrector detecting grammatical errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The study methods are presented in a clear manner that is understandable to the reader.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
There is an inconsistency in the number of interviews in the methodology (n=168) with respect to the number of the universe obtained in the results (n=185).	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions are important for the public and are interesting because of the novelty of the topic that is currently being experienced. Studies of this nature will help understand how COVID acts. the writing is supported by the content of the writing.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>The references are understandable and adequate, as well as updated on the subject of COVID.</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):

It is recommended to check the spaces (doubles, triples, or absence) that can result in the detection of grammatical errors by the proofreader. It is suggested to review the consistency of the interviews in the methodology and the universe obtained in the results.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

It is suggested to accept the article with the small changes suggested to the author. The article contains interesting data that can help understand how it acts, affects, or develops in one of the first lines of action personnel in this pandemic, such as nursing.