

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_127127
Title of the Manuscript:	Nursing Workforce Issues a Review of the Literature on Staffing Levels and Patient Outcomes
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it highlights the significant impact of nursing staffing levels on patient outcomes, a topic of growing concern given the current healthcare workforce challenges. By synthesizing evidence linking adequate staffing with reduced adverse events, improved patient satisfaction, and enhanced clinical outcomes, the manuscript provides valuable insights for policy and decision-makers in healthcare. It identifies key barriers, such as financial constraints and regulatory requirements, and offers practical recommendations, thereby contributing to the discourse on effective staffing practices in healthcare. The emphasis on evidence-based staffing guidelines and future research directions makes this review highly relevant for optimizing healthcare delivery and supporting the nursing workforce.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, " <i>Nursing Workforce Issues: A Review of the Literature on Staffing Levels and Patient Outcomes</i> ," is suitable as it effectively conveys the article's focus on examining the relationship between nursing staffing levels and patient outcomes. However, to make it more impactful and clearly highlight the relevance of staffing levels to patient care, a more refined title could be: "Nursing Staffing Levels and Patient Outcomes: A Comprehensive Literature Review on Workforce Challenges and Quality of Care." This revised title emphasizes the study's focus on the effects of staffing on patient outcomes while highlighting the workforce challenges, making it more specific and appealing to the target audience.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is generally comprehensive, providing a clear summary of the key topics, findings, and recommendations related to nursing staffing levels and their impact on patient outcomes. However, a few additions could enhance clarity and completeness: 1. Explicit Mention of Specific Patient Outcomes: While the abstract mentions patient safety, satisfaction, and clinical results, it could be more specific by briefly listing some of the adverse outcomes associated with inadequate staffing, such as medication errors, infections, and patient falls. 2. Highlight Research Gaps: The abstract could briefly mention identified gaps in the literature that require further exploration, such as the need to investigate staffing impacts on different patient demographics (e.g., elderly or chronically ill patients) or alternative staffing models. 3. Include Implications for Practice: Adding a line that emphasizes the practical implications for healthcare providers, including hospital administrators and nurse managers, would reinforce the importance of implementing evidence-based staffing models. These enhancements would provide a clearer and more detailed preview of the article's content and the practical significance of its findings.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, providing a logical flow of information from the background and significance of staffing levels to specific factors influencing these levels, their impact on patient outcomes, and implications for policy and practice. The structured approach makes it easier for readers to follow the progression of ideas.	

Review Form 3

	<p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add a "Methodology" Section: Including a dedicated section on methodology would improve transparency. Detailing the search strategy, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and methods for reviewing the literature would make it clearer how studies were selected and analyzed for this review. 2. Consider Reordering for Readability: Placing "Factors Influencing Staffing Levels" before discussing "Patient Safety," "Patient Satisfaction," and "Clinical Outcomes" may improve the flow. Readers would first understand what impacts staffing levels, then how staffing levels subsequently impact outcomes. 3. Expand on "Future Research Directions": While the manuscript includes future research directions, expanding this section to discuss how specific research findings could fill the existing gaps would make it more robust. These adjustments would enhance the manuscript's clarity, depth, and value to the scientific community. 	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its thorough synthesis of existing literature and evidence-based approach. It systematically reviews the relationship between nursing staffing levels and patient outcomes, which is well-supported by multiple studies and references, highlighting the consistency of findings across different healthcare settings. By examining various outcome metrics like patient safety, satisfaction, and clinical results, the manuscript offers a comprehensive view of staffing impacts on healthcare quality.</p> <p>Its analysis of influencing factors and policy implications demonstrates a strong understanding of both the practical challenges and systemic issues related to staffing, making it a valuable contribution to the field.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>The references in this manuscript are both sufficient and recent, providing a solid foundation for the discussion on nursing staffing levels and patient outcomes. The references span a variety of credible sources, including recent studies from the last few years that contribute to the timeliness and relevance of the review. The inclusion of foundational literature alongside more current research allows for a balanced perspective.</p> <p>However, if possible, adding more recent studies from 2023-2024 that further explore innovative staffing models or specific patient outcomes might enhance the manuscript's contemporary relevance.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and precise terminology used throughout. The manuscript is well-structured, making complex ideas accessible, and the flow between sections is smooth. However, a few minor adjustments to sentence structure and clarity could enhance readability further. A careful proofreading for any minor grammatical errors or inconsistencies would improve the overall polish and maintain a high standard of academic writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript provides a comprehensive and well-researched review of the relationship between nursing staffing levels and patient outcomes. The depth of analysis and the integration of current literature are commendable, contributing valuable insights to the field. It would be beneficial to expand on the discussion of staffing models, perhaps by exploring emerging trends in staffing strategies or addressing some of the challenges healthcare systems face when implementing these models.</p> <p>Brief section on the potential cost-effectiveness of staffing interventions could be valuable for policymakers and healthcare administrators. Otherwise, the manuscript is solid and informative.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asmat Parveen
Department, University & Country	Islamic University Science of Technology, Indian