

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_126537
Title of the Manuscript:	NURSING DIAGNOSES IN PATIENTS UNDER INTENSIVE CARE
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Kindly mention the type of review in title.2. Table 1: Mention authors name in sentence form only (first letter capital then small letters) not in the capital letter.3. Mention the need of this review at the end of introduction.4. Need to revise PRISMA flow chart, there are some suggestions: Remove the word meta-analysis from PRSIMA Chart as it is not meta-analysis. How 421 articles reach to 12 articles, explain how you excluded 421-12=409 articles. Then how 8 articles excluded, kindly mention the reason of exclusion.	<p>Noted</p> <p>Ok done</p> <p>Noted and revised</p> <p>Ok</p>

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	