

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_116226
Title of the Manuscript:	Integration of Customized Wheelchair Tracking and Durable Medical Equipment's Solutions for Hospitals: A Continuous Quality Improvement Project
Type of the Article	Original Research 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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p>	<p>It is important for the scientific community, since it addresses a relevant problem in the field of hospital management and medical equipment logistics. The study proposes a model to reduce the number of lost wheelchairs in a clinical center, which has direct implications on operational efficiency and associated costs.</p> <p>The qualitative study design, along with the methodologies used (such as process flow chat, stakeholder interviews, and fishbone diagram), provides a solid foundation for the analysis and conclusions presented. The results show a significant reduction in the rate of lost wheelchairs thanks to the investment in high-quality wheelchairs, resulting in substantial operational savings for the hospital.</p> <p>The conclusion of the study highlights the importance of investing in durable and efficient equipment, such as Stryker TC wheelchairs, and recommends purchasing more units in the future. These recommendations are relevant to other clinical centers facing similar challenges with medical equipment management and can serve as a basis for future research in the field of hospital logistics.</p> <p>The manuscript offers valuable and practical information for the scientific community, especially for healthcare professionals, hospital administrators, and healthcare logistics experts interested in improving operational efficiency and reducing costs through innovative medical equipment management strategies.</p>	
<p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>It is adequate and clearly describes the content and approach of the presented study. The title highlights the integration of customized solutions for tracking wheelchairs and durable medical equipment in hospitals, which reflects the main objective of the continuous quality improvement project addressed in the article. The inclusion of key terms such as "customized solutions," "tracking," "durable medical equipment," and "continuous quality improvement" provides an accurate overview of the topic covered in the study.</p> <p>Overall, the title is clear, concise, and relevant to the content of the article, helping readers quickly understand the focus and importance of the study on the management of wheelchairs and medical equipment in hospital settings.</p>	
<p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p>	<p>Overall, the article summary covers the fundamental aspects of the study, from the objective to the conclusions and recommendations, providing a complete and clear overview of the research carried out in relation to wheelchair management in hospital settings.</p>	
<p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate and adequate for presenting research on wheelchair management at the NIH Clinical Center. The organization of the content into clearly defined sections, such as objective, study design, methodology, results and conclusions, facilitates understanding and reading of the article. Additionally, subsections within each section provide a detailed structure that guides the reader through the different aspects of the study, from planning to findings and recommendations.</p> <p>The inclusion of key elements such as the objective of the study, the description of the design and the methodology used, the results obtained and the conclusions derived from them is essential to provide a complete and coherent vision of the research carried out.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

	<p>Overall, the structure of the manuscript appears to be effective in clearly and concisely communicating the study's findings and implications for wheelchair management in a specific clinical setting.</p>	
<p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p>	<p>To evaluate whether a manuscript is scientifically correct, it is important to consider several aspects, such as methodological rigor, validity of the results, appropriate interpretation of the data, consistency in the presentation of information, and relevance of the conclusions. Because I do not have access to the specific content of the manuscript on wheelchair management at the NIH Clinical Center, I cannot conduct a detailed evaluation of its scientific validity. However, some key points to consider in determining the scientific validity of a manuscript include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Study design: It is important that the study has been designed in a rigorous manner, with appropriate methods to address the research question posed. 2. Sample and data analysis: The sample used in the study must be representative and sufficient to obtain valid conclusions. Furthermore, it is essential that statistical analyzes are appropriate and well-founded. 3. Results and conclusions: The results must be presented in a clear and concise manner, and the conclusions must be derived logically from the data obtained. 4. Relevance and scientific contribution: It is important that the study provides new knowledge or information relevant to the field of study, and that its results have significant implications. <p>In summary, to determine whether a manuscript is scientifically correct, it is necessary to carefully review all these aspects and evaluate whether the study meets the scientific standards established in the corresponding discipline. I would recommend that you carefully review the content of the manuscript and, if possible, consult with colleagues or experts on the subject to obtain a more accurate assessment of its scientific validity.</p>	
<p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The references you provide in your manuscript on wheelchair management at the NIH Clinical Center span a variety of sources, from scientific articles to websites and news stories. Next, I will analyze the sufficiency and timeliness of the references you have included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scientific references: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - References [1], [6], [7] and [8] are scientific articles published in peer-reviewed scientific journals. These are reliable and relevant academic resources to support the scientific content of your manuscript. - Articles [6], [7] and [8] address topics related to radio frequency identification (RFID) technologies in the healthcare sector, which may be relevant to the management of wheelchairs in clinical settings. 2. Website and news references: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - References [2], [3], [4] and [5] are links to websites and news related to wheelchair monitoring in hospital environments. These sources can provide practical and current information on technological solutions for wheelchair management. - It is important to note that online sources can vary in terms of reliability and timeliness, so it is advisable to check the credibility of the websites and the date of publication of the news. 3. Other references: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - References [9] and [10] are links to NIH Clinical Center web pages, which may be relevant to contextualize the clinical setting of the study. - Reference [11] is a resource on using the Fishbone tool for root cause analysis, which could be useful if you are addressing a specific problem in wheelchair management. <p>In general, the references that have been included cover a variety of sources relevant to the topic of study. However, it is important to ensure that online sources are reliable and that the information is up-to-date. I would recommend that you review each reference to evaluate its relevance and veracity in relation to the content of your manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It has clear and concise content that effectively communicates the purpose, study design, methodology, results, and conclusions of research on wheelchair management at the NIH Clinical Center. However, there are some corrections and improvements that could be made in terms of language/English quality for stronger academic communication:</p> <p>1. It is suggested to review and correct the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "process flow chat" should be "process flow diagram". - "root cause analysis" should be "root cause analysis". - "A fishbone diagram was constructed to understand the flow and direction of the problem being investigated" could be restructured for greater clarity. <p>2. It is recommended to improve coherence and precision in writing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make sure to maintain consistency in your use of tenses and grammatical structures throughout the summary. - Review the accuracy of the wording to avoid unnecessary repetitions or redundancies. <p>3. Consider including additional details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You could provide more information about the methodology used in the research, such as the number of interviews conducted or how stakeholders are selected. - It would be useful to add details on the practical implications of the findings and how they could be applied in other clinical settings. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>none</p>	

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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Miguel Angel Amaró Garrido</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Medical Sciences, Cuba</p>