

---

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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!***

<b>Reviewer Name:</b>	<b>Email:</b>
<b>Date Manuscript Received:</b> 24 / 08 /2017	<b>Date Manuscript Review Submitted:</b> 25 / 08 / 2017
<b>Manuscript Title:</b> Nurses' Awareness of Infection Control Measures, and the Role and Effect in Patient and Family Education.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06116/17	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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>5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The title explains the research and presentation.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Background, objectives, methods and results are clearly presented.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> It is recommended to tighten-up the language by closer proof reading and copy editing.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The methodology and methods need justification by providing literature support. It is not clear at the moment, why a quantitative methodology was selected. Please justify that and explain.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The body of the paper is generally clear, however, it would be good to divide the results into sub-sections and sub-headings, so the reader can clearly understand the findings.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The discussion section is very good, but need a conclusion to the paper by summarizing the key areas of the paper.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The current references are comprehensive and appropriate, however, include some references that justify the methodology and methods.	

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

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

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

This is a very good paper, which needs following action:

1. Tighten-up the paper by closer proof reading and copy editing.
2. Justify the methodology and methods by providing literature support and references.
3. Create sub-headings to the findings, which can be linked to the discussion.
4. Write a strong but brief conclusion that summarize the key areas of the paper.

Overall, this is a very good effort and well done.

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

This is a very interesting paper and should be published after the minor-revisions that I have suggested. The authors have clearly made an effort to present their research in a scientific manner and that should be appreciated. Following are my suggested minor revisions:

1. Tighten-up the paper by closer proof reading and copy editing.
2. Justify the methodology and methods by providing literature support and references.
3. Create sub-headings to the findings, which can be linked to the discussion.
4. Write a strong but brief conclusion that summarize the key areas of the paper.

