

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJTDH_104628</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>KNOWLEDGE AND UTILIZATION OF GLASGOW COMA SCALE IN THE ASSESSMENT OF UNCONSCIOUS PATIENTS AMONG NURSES AT MODIBBO ADAMA UNIVERSITY TEACHING HOSPITAL YOLA, ADAMAWA STATE, NIGERIA.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original article</b>

### **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.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy> )

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript aims to determine the knowledge, utilization and factors that inhibit nurses in the application of the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) to assess unconscious patients in a University Teaching Hospital. More precisely, the specific objectives were to assess the level of nurses' knowledge on GCS, to evaluate the level of utilization of GCS in the care of unconscious patient among nurses, and to identify factors that hinder effective utilization of GCS among nurses at the University hospital. This subject is interesting and the findings from this study are relevant to raise awareness about the practical knowledge of GCS and confidence to evaluate unconscious patients by nurses in this unit.</p> <p>The title of the manuscript is suitable for the text presented, however, it is very long. The abstract is comprehensive and represents the content described in the manuscript. However, there are a few sentences and words in the abstract that can be reviewed for English tense correspondence. (Such suggestions are highlighted in the manuscript copy returned to the editor).</p> <p>The subsections are structured in an appropriate way. However, the organization of the sentences lacks necessary structure. The manuscript seems scientifically correct.</p> <p>Here are a few suggestions to improve the quality of this manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the abstract, the results are presented in the FINDINGS subsection of the abstract. However, in the main text, the results are presented in the RESULTS section.</li> <li>2. Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The abbreviation GCS must be described initially as "Glasgow Coma Scale", then as GCS later in the body of the text. Therefore, it should be abbreviated in the first sentence of the introduction.</li> <li>- The fifth paragraph contains a long sentence that must be reviewed for clarity.</li> <li>- The sixth paragraph needs to be reviewed for clarity. The first sentence is too long.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the subtopic 3.1 -Demographic Data of respondent, the first sentence should be reviewed for clarity. "The result (table 1) Shows..."</li> <li>- In the title of the subtopic 3.2 Knowledge, Utilization and Perceived factors that Hinder effective Utilization of GCS Level of Knowledge On GCS, several letters are in the capes format. Such pattern is repeated throughout the manuscript.</li> <li>- Continuing in this same subtopic, the next sentence says: "Majority of the respondents 58(50%) had formal training on GCS post registration more than 1 year ago" . 50% is not majority, it is half.</li> <li>- Table 1: must be aligned. The way it is now does not provide an easy reading of the information. The authors should change the format.</li> <li>- Table 2 also must be reviewed in order to provide visual organization. The columns are not well aligned.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are some extremely long sentences in the discussion and in other sections of the manuscript. Authors should review it in order to provide a</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<b>better reading of the text.</b> <b>Overall, the text must be reviewed for structure, English writing and formatting.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English writing must be improved. An English review of the text is needed.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ana Quenia Gomes da Silva</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Bahia, Brazil</b>