



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Night-Shift Work, Self-Reported Well-Being, and Perceived Patient Care Quality Among ICU Nurses: A Cross-Sectional Survey”

Submitted: 18 July 2026

Accepted: 08 October 2026

Published: 31 October 2026

Corresponding Author: Yasser A. Abu Jaish

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n30p101

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Julian Kraja
University of Shkodra “Luigj Gurakuqi”, Albania

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Julian KRAJA	
University, Country: University of Shkodra “Luigj Gurakuqi”, ALBANIA	
Date Manuscript Received: 06. 08. 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 07. 08. 2026
Manuscript Title: Association Between Night-Shift Schedules, Nurse Well-Being, and Perceived Patient Care Quality Among ICU Nurses: A Cross-Sectional Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0812/26	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper is available in the “review history” of the paper: 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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
-----------	---

1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	5
<i>Yes, the title is clear and appropriate.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	3
<i>The abstract is organizationally correct, but the results section in the abstract does not provide concrete results. Therefore, the results section should be modified.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>The paper has problems with the English language, grammatical problems. It needs a good editing.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The manuscript has a good methodological structure, but there are some shortcomings. The authors do not argue why 100 nurses are sufficient. They include 123 nurses. What percentage of nurses do these 123 nurses make up of the total number of nurses in the centers where the study was conducted? It is not given how these 123 nurses are divided according to the respective centers, etc. For testing the study instrument, the authors do not provide data on Cronbach's alpha coefficients.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are clear and have no errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Overall, the conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Even the references are comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	Yes
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is an interesting paper and I want to congratulate the authors, but it needs some intervention. I would recommend editing for English and improving the methodology.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: