

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_129337
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>An Assessment of Indigenous Ethnic Group Perception on Baylon’s Quality Patient Nursing Care Theory in Selected Barangays in Kalinga Province in the Philippines.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b>	<b>Author’s Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<p>The study is timely and important to understand ethnic indigenous people perception about the quality of nursing care.</p> <p>The study explores the use of Baylon’s Quality Patient Nursing Care Theory to understand participants’ perception on “the factors to be considered if patients will submit to hospitalization or not, is determined by the quality patient health care and factors that boost patients’ recovery with the help of expected government programs to eliminate self-image problems due to their diagnosis</p> <p>It offers recommendations for the Indigenous Ethnic Group, staff nurses, doctors, hospital administrators, as well as officials from the Department of Health and the National Government</p>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Suitable	
<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>The abstract is poorly written. The author’s guideline was not followed. It does not take note of the established scientific steps of background, aim, method, results and conclusion</p> <p>It is too lengthy, more than 300 words, not coincide, there are repetitions.</p> <p>Some reports were contrarily to what was written in the main manuscripts. Example s: the research design was confusing. There is a mix up between qualitative and quantitative design</p> <p>Result section was scanty or important results were not included</p> <p>So, there is need for complete overhauling of the abstract</p>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	No. The study is good but it is not scientifically correct. The research methodology is very poor	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are current and sufficient.	

**Review Form 3**

<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes. The English language is suitable for scholarly communication. However, some editing may be needed	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kolawole Damilare Ogundeji</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Walter Sisulu University, South Africa</b>