

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_95738
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of Nursing Standards operating procedures (SOP's) for ward management Practices: An Initiative towards Quality Assurance
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. <b>Yes, the manuscript important for scientific community because improvement in nursing care not only enhance patient satisfaction but also outcome of patient from suffering. Developing and documenting SOPs for ward management is very relevant in era of litigations, consumerism and need for evidence-based medicine.</b>  2. <b>Yes, the title of the article is suitable</b>  3. <b>Abstract may include methodology in brief and recommendation</b>  4. <b>Summary and conclusions along with few recommendations to be added</b>  5. <b>Yes, it is scientifically relevant</b>  6. <b>Style of references need improvement as per recommended scope of style of Journal</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Minor Revision as suggested and language/spelling corrections highlighted and suggested corrections in green highlight done	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It may be accepted with minor revision as topic is very relevant from quality point of view	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mukesh Yadav</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Atal Bihari Vajpaae Medical University, India</b>