

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 | |

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. It is an pivotal topic for research ; 2. The title has merit and highlights the article; 3. At abstract, minor style and grammar corrections are needed; 4. The subsections seem confusing to whoever wrote the paper, with parts that seems like a vindictive paragraph described as objective, and results appearing as a scope, also in objective paragraph; 5. The results are scientifically corrects, but can increase the prominence and expressiveness if a more appropriate statistic is used; 6. The references are recent, but not sufficient (09 papers); 7. The results deserve a better statistical treatment; 8. The great explanation about geographical differences between two areas of sample, and repercussions of SOS, was lost at the discussion, explaining that training can result in fast and successful strategies for increasing survival in sudden cardiac arrest. 9. There are very long and confuses paragraphs at the discussion part. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | 10. I really recommend a major revision about signals, spaces, formatting and uppercase uses. There are a lot of mistakes and missings throughout the text, all highlighted. | |
| Optional/General comments | it is good material that needs to be better worked on and adjusted before publishing. | |

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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Maíra Florentino Pessoa |
| Department, University & Country | Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brazil |