

**Paper: “Evaluating the Impact of a Teaching Program on Nurses' Performance during CVP Measurement in Intensive Care Units: A Quasi-Experimental Study”**

**Submitted: 29 May 2023**

**Accepted: 22 November 2023**

**Published: 30 November 2023**

Corresponding Author: Yasser Adnan Abu Jaish

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n33p116

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ruth M. Gallegos Torres  
Universidad Autonoma de Queretaro, Mexico

Reviewer 2: Gordana Stankovska  
University of Tetova, Republic of Macedonia

Reviewer 3: Jacqueline Kituku  
Kenyatta University, Kenya

# 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: Sept, 16	Date Review Report Submitted: Sept, 20
Manuscript Title: The Effect of the Teaching Program on Nurses' Practices Regarding the Implementation of Patient Care and Safety Measures during Central Venous Pressure Measurement in the Critical Care Units in Syria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0620/23	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The abstract needs to have just 250 words. Try not to repeat information. The information about the design, must be included in the methods in the manuscript.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Regarding with the introduction, I suggest to write all information without subtitles.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Related with the pilot test, it is necessary to explain where was conducted, if nurses were different with final sample. I can find more information about data collection on the abstract than the document. Details are necessary into the document. Could be helpful to put the information about the educational program after data collection. After data analysis, ethic aspects could be clearly.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>If you are going a explain results in detail with a narration, it is not necessary to put a table and a graph. It is better to choose just one option. Same situation than above with results related with all the variables.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>It is necessary not to repeat results on the discussion section. It is important to discuss the results of the study with more authors. There are some grammatical errors.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>You need to review how authors are refer in the document.</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):**

# 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: Gordana Stankovska	
University/Country: University of Tetova/Republic of North Macedonia	
Date Manuscript Received: 20.10.2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 23.10.2023
Manuscript Title: The Effect of the Teaching Program on Nurses' Practices Regarding the Implementation of Patient Care and Safety Measures during Central Venous Pressure Measurement in the Critical Care Units in Syria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0620/23	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	5

<i>The title is clear enough and is absolutely straight to the point of the content of the paper. The topic of the article is rather interesting and important as the interest the rule of nurses, their theoretical knowledge and practical work with the patients in the critical care units.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>This is the original research article which clearly describes research question and objectives of the study, recognition of limitations and emphasis of the implications of the study, introduces relevant conclusions and introduces relevant literature.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>There are no grammatical mistakes</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The methodological sections has been explained clearly and should give readers enough information. The authors use quantitative analysis to explain their results.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The results are interpreted appropriately and they are significant. From them we can see that that the level of knowledge and practice of the studied nurses in CVP measurement was average and poor before the teaching program and the nurse's level improved after the program. The authors put tyhem in tables and figures which are very clear and adequate.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusions are very clear and are in the context with the main aim of the paper</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The references are in the context of article.</i>	

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

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

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

**The paper is very good and interesting from theoretical and practical aspects.**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**It's a publishable article and J recommend it for publishing in the journal.**

# 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: Jacqueline Kituku	
University/Country: Kenyatta University, Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/09/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/10/2023
Manuscript Title: The Effect of the Teaching Program on Nurses' Practices Regarding the Implementation of Patient Care and Safety Measures during Central Venous Pressure Measurement in the Critical Care Units in Syria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0620/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <del>No</del>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/ <del>No</del>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/ <del>No</del>	

## 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>3</b>

The effect as per the title should be brought out clearly in the results.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
The abstract presents objects and methods clearly. However, the results are not elaborate. They do not bring out the exact effect. The abstract is too long (2 pages), it should be limited to one page of about 350 words bringing out the key results.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
There is a mixture of present and past tenses. There is repeated use of redundant words.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
The study methods are not well explained. There is no logical flow. It is too long and difficult to follow. It is not clear how the study was conducted, where it conducted and why it was conducted there. What exactly did the researcher aim to achieve by carrying out this study? What did the researcher do to achieve the objectives of the study? How was the sample size calculated? How were the study participants selected? What was the inclusion and exclusion criteria? There are notable grammatical errors with clear mixture of tenses.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
There is repeated use of redundant words. The researcher should either use tables or figures when presenting results and avoid using both simultaneously. The percentage effect should be clearly brought out.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
The conclusion should summarise the key findings of the study. Recommendations should address the clear gaps brought out by the findings. The discussion is not clear. It should encompass a comparison between the study findings and other related studies and the reasons for the differences or similarities.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
The references are appropriate and comprehensive.	

**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):**

The article should contain a summarized background and methods. There should be consistency in presenting the results. The results should be clearly. The discussion should bring out the similarities or differences between the study findings and what other authors found and why. Lastly, the article is too long. Endeavor to summarise in not more than 12 pages.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**