

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_121135</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Care and infection control measures in the intensive care unit with emphasis on nursing roles: narrative review</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The topic is relevant to scientific community. However, the paper is not able to underscore issues specific to the context of nursing practice. Do nurses have the competency to mitigate and manage HAIs? It indicates general issues on HAIs. I did not see any gaps that the outcomes of this study could address.</p>	<p>We included the role of nurses in the literature review, marked in yellow.</p>
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>"Nursing roles in the prevention and care of health -associated infections in intensive care units: A Narrative review study"</p>	<p>The title has been changed as suggested</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Abstract must be in structured format to ensure that all essential information of an abstract are conveyed to the readers. Subsections of Abstract are: background of the study, objective, methods, results and brief discussion, conclusion, and key words.</p>	<p>The suggestions in the abstract and in the article about the structure have been realised, marked in yellow.</p>
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>NO</b></p> <p>The necessary elements of a narrative review were not observed in this study. The process of review must have logically organized structure and discussed in the manuscript before the actual textual review. The common structure for narrative literature reviews is IMRaD, which was not applied. In <b>Introduction</b>, state not just the general objective, but as well as the specific objectives. In <b>Method</b> section, describe step by step how the study was performed. State the research design by specifying the type of narrative literature review you utilized in the paper. What search terms did you use to look for the literature? Where did you look? Were they findings of literature retrieved from searches of computerized databases, hand searches, and authoritative texts? Will you limit on research articles or include other published sources such as books, case reports, etc.? What is the scope of review as to inclusion and exclusion criteria of relevant literature? In <b>Results</b>, specify the key concepts and new findings. Underscore the outcomes to attaining the study objectives. Results and major concepts are evaluated, synthesized, and interpreted in the <b>Discussion</b>. Discuss the implications of the review results in healthcare practice and healthcare delivery system. Connect the major concepts to research potential. Provide <b>Conclusions</b> from the evidences describe and synthesize from the available literature on the topic understudied.</p>	<p>The corrections were made We included the methodology, even though the narrative review did not have all the criteria that were suggested, because the search protocol is mandatory in integrative and systematic reviews, which is not the case in our study. The definition and criteria of a narrative review do not require the use of a search protocol or the exhaustion of sources. Several studies have been published that are similar to the structure of our study, including in the JAMMR journal itself. The fact that it is simpler does not compromise the quality of the study, and we achieved the objective that was proposed in the study within the scope of the narrative review.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is NOT scientifically robust and technically sound. Author(s) are generally not aware of the methodology, selections criteria and processes of conducting narrative literature review. Overall, the paper does not provide a wide-ranging perspective of the author(s). The review is not a comprehensive, critical, and objective analysis of the topic. The Introduction and Literature Review sections lack coherence and are mixed up. "Performance of nurses" must be operationally defined. Clarify the concepts of "care" and "infection control measures" in the specific objectives. Keep the foci of the study clear and defined. Indicate not just the trends, issues, and objectives (must be general and specific) state as well the GAPS that your study could address. Discuss the potential contributions of your review to practice, policy, research, and theory.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p>=</p>	<p>References are recent but not sufficient to come up with a comprehensive review. Having only 26 in the Reference list indicates that the narrative review was not comprehensive and holistic. References must focus more on nursing journals since the review involves nurses and the nursing practice.</p>	<p>The study has 31 references, most of them from major journals such as the BMC, indexed and prestigious in medical literature</p>

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>Organize the Introduction by first underscoring the TRENDS, followed by ISSUES by focusing on the roles of nurses in the prevention and management of HAIs, then GAPS, Objective of the study, and Contributions of the study results. Provide at least 4 best <b>EVIDENCES</b> synthesis to the <b>CLAIMS</b> made in each paragraph of the review.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>	