

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_123252
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the Effect of SBAR Communication Training on Inter-Professional Team Collaboration in Rwanda
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The study will contribute to the understanding of the importance of effective communication in healthcare settings, particularly in improving patient outcomes and reducing medical errors that may arise from miscommunication or missed communication. The study indicates that SBAR communication training for nurses in the emergency department has significantly improved their competencies in inter-professional collaboration, leading to better patient care. I appreciated the manuscript, as it serves as evidence that improvements in communication and collaboration skills enhance service delivery.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is still interesting, but I suggest the following revision: 'Enhancing Team Collaboration in the Emergency Department at Kigali University Teaching Hospital: The effect of SBAR Communication Training.' This revision will make the topic more informative for those interested in health settings.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract effectively addresses the background, objective, method, results, and conclusion of the study. However, there are areas that need revision. Some aspects that require improvement include: the use of lengthy sentences (try to make them more concise) and the specificity of the results (e.g., to better illustrate the effectiveness of the training, provide results in percentage).</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate for the content and objectives of the study, as the writer(s) has/have followed a logical progression consistent with the components of a research report. However, some subsections may require more detailed explanation and emphasis (e.g., limitations of the study), and additional sections should be included (for example, implications of the study or directions for future research, as the study can guide further action or investigation).</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, as it is based on a well-defined research design, methodology, and statistical analysis. The use of pre-tests and post-tests has allowed the researcher(s) to assess the effectiveness of SBAR communication training. The validity and reliability tests conducted on the data collection tool further enhance the study's credibility. Additionally, the manuscript addresses ethical considerations, including informed consent and data privacy, which are crucial for maintaining scientific integrity.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript include a mix of recent and older studies. However, there are very few comprehensive and up-to-date references that could help enhance the article's credibility and relevance. Out of the 24 cited sources, only 2 are from the past five years (since 2019). Additionally, the article could benefit from including theoretical reviews in the field to further bolster its credibility.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is good but requires attention in the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar and Syntax: There are some grammatical errors. For example, in the abstract, the phrase 'the number is even big' should be revised to 'the number is even larger.' Complexity and Length of Sentences: Overly complex or lengthy sentences should be edited for clarity and conciseness. Consistency in Terminology: There is a lack of consistency in terminology. For instance, use either 'health workers' or 'healthcare providers' consistently throughout the manuscript. Proofreading: The manuscript needs thorough editorial work to correct typographical errors, punctuation issues, and other mistakes. For example, in the 'Background of the Study' section, paragraph two contains the phrase 'Numerous researches revealed that miscommunication is accounts for more than 70,' which should be revised. Additionally, in the same section and paragraph what is spelt as 'theSituation' and paragraph four contains 'countriesand...' which needs correction. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Increasing the number of recent references, as well as including a diverse range of sources, would enhance the article's acceptability within the scientific community. Specifically, incorporating local studies or sources from African contexts, as well as citing sources from existing theories or recent key guidelines from the WHO, could further strengthen the article.</p> <p>There are no major ethical issues in the manuscript. The report addresses informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality, ensures voluntary participation of respondents, and confirms the presence of ethical approval from the relevant body</p> <p>Although the manuscript does not report any affiliations or potential conflicts of interest, it would be beneficial for the researcher(s) to explicitly state whether they have any affiliation or involvement with the hospital that could be perceived as introducing bias. Additionally, the manuscript should declare any sources of funding and potential conflicts of interest, if applicable.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment (if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>		

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Amare Bayissa Hundessa</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Oromia Police College, Ethiopia</p>