

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_103003
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF NURSES/MIDWIVES' KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS RETENTIONRETENTION ON NEONATAL RESUSCITATION, IN OBIO COTTAGE HOSPITAL
Type of the 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.journalajrnh.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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>yes</p> <p>Retention word , repeated, A Quasi-experimental study better to add at the end.</p> <p>comprehensive but not structured.</p> <p>NO</p> <p>yes</p> <p>Up to 15 better, in the text citation was not followed journal guidelines.</p> <p>The introduction was huge and better to cut short. Keywords are better to be in alphabetical order, in MeSH terms and better to use words which are not in the title. In the discussion no need for subheadings.Better to expand and compare with the similar studies Better to cut short the recommendations. in conclusion better not to include any values. The sample size is better to add. Statistics are very good but better to cut short the tables if possible. The results format was not good. What are the measures taken to decrease the bias? How is the comparison group taken? are they similar?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>better to improve</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>SPSS version country better to mention</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:	Rakesh Kotha
Department, University & Country	Osmania University, India