

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_101347
Title of the Manuscript:	Adult Inpatient Hospital Falls with Injury: A Retrospective Analysis
Type of the Article	Original 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)
<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>1. Yes, it's important to scientific community. The author/s investigated factors responsible for major injuries during patients falling. As author/s explained in the manuscript such factors are unknown in previous studies.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. The manuscript subsections are correct except one for nursing implication which should be moved to the introduction part. The manuscript structure has many issues, the introduction part is not organized into background, problem statement, proposed solution, literature reviews, and aim. The results section contained organization errors, ex; figure 1 is placed at the beginning of the results without beforehand details, figure 2 is placed at the end of the results not after in context details, tables 1-9 are not listed in the results section. The discussion part contained tables which should be moved to the results, table 9 contained unrequired details and lacked clarity about how it was calculated for each patient or for all patients.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. No, many references are missing.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zahraa Kamaz
Department, University & Country	Iraq