

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_83249
Title of the Manuscript:	Advanced Cardiovascular Life Support Performance: Study on the Effectiveness of Training among Nurses in a Tertiary Care Hospital, Karachi
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Introduction: As a way of publicizing the updated guidelines it is important to mention the AHA 2020 guideline - it can be included alongside or replacing citation 1, 2, 3 or 4. Currently there are several studies on training programs, it seemed strange to describe that there are few (7). see this site Resuscitation Education Science: Educational Strategies to Improve Outcomes From Cardiac Arrest https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/CIR.0000000000000583</p> <p>Materials and methods: it was not clear how the participants were selected - describe the inclusion and exclusion criteria, and how the follow-up stage was after 6 weeks. Was a questionnaire applied? Or had practice? What is the justification for this period, since studies show good results immediately at the end of training and that skills decline about 3 months later? About the sample: was it calculated from how many nurses? How many were there in total? This data facilitates the understanding of the percentage of trained professionals in relation to the total.</p> <p>Results: I suggest starting this topic with a brief description of how many nurses participated in the study so that the reader can have an overview of the participants. The tables show the same data described in the text. I suggest choose only one way of presenting the data to avoid repeating the same information. Is it possible to present the results of practice? You can explain about the advantages and difficulties at this stage.</p> <p>Discussion: as the results became clear about the advantages of training. The arguments can be strengthened and diversified with approaches about: e.g. - impact of training on a greater chance of survival; relate to the new chain of survival (AHA/2020 https://cpr.heart.org/en/resuscitation-science/cpr-and-ecc-guidelines) which included the sixth link related to recovery; - minimization of neurological sequelae and quality of life; - importance of new trainings (currently, in situ simulation, low-dose and high-frequency training programs are discussed).</p> <p>References: almost 50% are old, I suggest using the most current ones, published in the last 5 years. Indicating DOI or access link facilitates the articles location.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>I understand that each location has its own norm for obtaining the consent of the research participant, but generally, in addition to the authorization of the institution's manager, it is recommended to obtain the consent of the people who participated in the research, that is, the nurses, in the case of this study.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lucia Tobase
Department, University & Country	Centro Universitário São Camilo, São Paulo