

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_119503
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Chinese Nursing Students Perception in Cardiopulmonary Preparedness Weifang University of Science and Technology in China
Type of the Article	

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript contains the important information on nursing students readiness regarding cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) in any emergency situation. The topic is interesting and important for scientific community for exploring knowledge and skill of nursing community on this critical skill. The title is suitable, however I suggest minor changes as "Assessment of Chinese Nursing Students' Perceived readiness regarding Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation at Weifang University of Science and Technology in China". The abstract is comprehensive and provide adequate information. However I suggest to remove title in the first paragraph and there is no need to add scope and limitations in the abstract. While the aim should be specifically focus on the objective. The other content should be removed "The study was focused on 309..... China". The mean score of 97.31 has been mentioned in the result. No need to further replicate the sentence in conclusion. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound and correct. The reference are sufficient however need to be more updated on last five years. While the same reference style should be adapted. <p>I suggest it's better to write result and discussion section separately. While, there is need to discuss important findings with previous literature to compare study findings in terms of similarity and contrast.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The complete manuscript should be checked and need careful revision for typos and grammatical mistakes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript is good and provide interesting information and is accepted after corrections of minor changes.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mishal Liaqat
Department, University & Country	Al-Aleem Institute of Nursing, Pakistan