

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_AJRID_118056</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Nursing Interventions to Prevent Pressure Ulcers in Critically Ill Patients: A Review of the Evidence</b>
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.journalajrid.com/index.php/AJRID/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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Very much.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, partially</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Fair.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flow chart could be shown for the methodology for more clarity?</li> <li>It is not revealed how many studies were retrieved, how many were discarded for what reasons and finally how many studies were included for Data analysis.</li> <li>Final studies included for analysis could be shown in Standard Table form with findings and level of incidence.</li> <li>No evidence level is shown for any of the studies that were discussed / written in the MS.</li> <li>Discussion part could be improved.</li> </ul>	

### 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>M Jayalakshmi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>P P Savani University, India</b>