

Paper: “Nivel de Conocimiento Sobre Cuidados Paliativos del Personal de Enfermería en un Hospital de Segundo Nivel”

Submitted: 10 February 2023

Accepted: 06 April 2023

Published: 30 April 2023

Corresponding Author: Carolina Jazmin Uranga Montero

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n12p17](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n12p17)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Alberto Juárez Lira

Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro, Facultad de Enfermería, Querétaro, México

Reviewer 2: Ruth M. Gallegos Torres

Universidad Autonoma de Queretaro, Mexico

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: 21 feb 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 28 feb 2023
Manuscript Title: Nivel de conocimiento sobre cuidados paliativos del personal de enfermería en un hospital de segundo nivel	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0247/23	
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
<i>The title is clear and appropriate to the content of the article. It is suggested that the phrase "Pasante De Servicio Social en..." be omitted in the description of the authors.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Mention in the results what is the estimated value of the results. For example: "less than 14 points" = insufficient level of knowledge; "between 15 and 17 points" = sufficient level of knowledge.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
-	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Change the phrase "quantitative descriptive observational cross-sectional study" to cross-sectional study.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The spacing of tables should be "single" and not "multiple".</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
-	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
-	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Review and adjust some formatting elements of the paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Ruth Magdalena Gallegos Torres	
University/Country: Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro	
Date Manuscript Received: February 21 st	Date Review Report Submitted: February 28 th
Manuscript Title: Nivel de conocimiento sobre cuidados paliativos del personal de enfermería en un hospital de segundo nivel	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 47.02.2023	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>Hay aspectos por mejorar que se indican en el documento</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Se sugiere revisar la longitud de los párrafos, la secuencia de la información y la redacción.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Hay información faltante que se indica en el escrito</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Independientemente de que se trata de una muestra pequeña, es necesario explotar aún más los hallazgos con cruce de variables y haciendo uso de las pruebas estadísticas apropiadas</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Al reforzar la sección de resultados este apartado puede mejorar</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: