

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_97714
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Community Preparedness in Cardio Pulmonary Emergencies in Selected Cities in the Philippines
Type of the Article	Empiric

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The subject under analysis/study is important and may have implications for health care practice. 2. Yes. 3. The abstract can be improved. Not being imperative, many publications disagree with the use of bibliographical references in the abstract. 4. Not having had access to a model/structure of formatting/organization of the Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health, I do not know if the authors respected the proposed structure. Despite that, I think it could be improved. 5. It can be improved. 6. Not at all. Although the authors have used references after 2017, there are numerous references of better scientific quality for this study.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. No. This is an aspect that I emphasize as quite negative. I even consider it a little disrespectful that at this level of scientific publication, texts of this nature are presented at this level.	
Optional/General comments	One of the aspects that deserve greater criticism is related to the presentation of bibliographic references and the respective low level they reflect. Since it is not possible to say with certainty which reference is respected by the authors, there is an absolute lack of uniformity and this aspect cannot be ignored.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	João Vítor da Silva Vieira
Department, University & Country	Instituto Politécnico de Beja, Portugal