

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_103611
Title of the Manuscript:	BURNOUT SYNDROME AMONG NURSES IN INTENSIVE CARE UNIT: AN ESSENTIAL APPROACH
Type of the Article	Short communication

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrn.com/index.php/AJRNH/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes. Burnout among nurses is an important issue. However, many relevant studies and reviews have been published before. It is good that the authors focused on a specific group of nurses (ICU). However, the later section, especially the interventions outlined in the paper were very general and not targeted at the ICU nurses. To improve the quality of the paper, these interventions should be more customized for the selected population.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Abstract can be improved by mentioning something apart from the definition of burnout, eg. the three levels of interventions.</p> <p>4. Considered acceptable as a short communication. (No actual results)</p> <p>5. Yes. But not scientifically comprehensive enough even as a short communication.</p> <p>6. Yes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Room for improvement in terms of English language. Suggest to send for professional proofreading. Some language amendments made on the track comments but not all are addressed. Inconsistent term and capitalization issue throughout the paper. eg. Burn-out, burnout, BOS, Burnout Syndrome – should be standardized eg. Nurses, Doctors- no need special capitalization</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I would reject this paper if submitted as a research/ full article. However, I think it can be published as a short communication if more detailed explanation are provided, especially in terms of the intervention as mentioned above.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lee Kun Yun
Department, University & Country	Institute of Health Management, National Institutes of Health, Malaysia