

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 highly relevant to the scientific community as it addresses a critical gap in the literature concerning the intersection of hemophilia, pregnancy, and psychosocial well-being. By focusing on first-time pregnant women with hemophilia, it provides a unique perspective on the specific challenges faced by this patient group, which has been underexplored in existing research. The combination of clinical management and emotional well-being in this study offers a more comprehensive understanding of the condition, potentially informing better healthcare interventions and patient support strategies. I appreciate the manuscript's potential to advance both clinical practice and patient advocacy, though some refinement in methodology could enhance its overall impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title combines two major themes—staffing levels and patient outcomes but it does not clearly indicate the relationship between them. Rephrasing it to emphasize this relationship, such as. Revised Title Suggestion: <i>"The Impact of Nursing Staffing Levels on Patient Outcomes: A Systematic Review with Implications for Healthcare Policy and Practice."</i>	
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 comprehensive, offering a clear overview of the main points regarding the impact of nursing staffing levels on patient outcomes. However, here are some suggestions: mentioning the scope (e.g., years covered, types of studies reviewed) or methodology (e.g., systematic or integrative review) would clarify the depth and rigor of the review; Specify Key Patient Outcomes: (e.g., reduction in infection rates, lower mortality, improved recovery times); If the review focuses on specific healthcare settings (e.g., hospitals, long-term care facilities) or regions (e.g., North America, Europe), this would be valuable to add for context; Providing a little more detail on the types of "evidence-based staffing guidelines" or specific funding recommendations would strengthen the.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript on nursing staffing levels and patient outcomes is clear, logical, and effectively organized	
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.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness by presenting a well-structured study design, rigorous data analysis, and clear presentation of results. The authors have followed a methodologically sound approach, ensuring reproducibility and reliability by detailing each experimental or analytical step. Furthermore, the research addresses a well-defined problem and employs relevant controls and statistical tests, reinforcing the validity of the conclusions drawn. Overall, the manuscript contributes valuable insights and stands on a solid scientific foundation, making it a meaningful addition to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references in this manuscript are generally sufficient and include recent, relevant studies that support the research framework and findings. Most citations are within the last five years, indicating the authors' attention to current literature. However, to further enhance the manuscript's depth, adding references from recent meta-analyses or systematic reviews on this topic could strengthen the background and discussion sections. If applicable, including foundational studies that outline critical methodologies or theories might also provide additional context for the findings.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication. The authors have used clear, concise, and precise language, which enhances the manuscript's readability and allows for an effective presentation of complex ideas. The structure and flow are logical, with appropriate use of scientific terminology that aligns well with the standards of academic writing. Minor grammatical or stylistic improvements could be made, but overall, the language quality meets the requirements for a scholarly publication.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Sabah Mahmoud Mahran
Department, University & Country	King Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia