

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: 03.08.2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>EXAMINING SURGICAL PATIENTS' EXPECTATIONS OF NURSING CARE AT KENYATTA NATIONAL HOSPITAL IN NAIROBI, KENYA</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0887/17	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>  <i>The title fits to the main idea of the paper.</i>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>  <i>Even the abstract consists of the sections needed in the abstract parts. I recommend author to remove the subtitles from the abstract.</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>  <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>It is possible to understand the way and the methodology of the paper.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>For this paper the conclusion part should be longer. In this context it will better for the readers and research to take in the ideas covered in the research paper.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>It is not possible to claim that the references chosen for the paper is sufficient.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>X</b>
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**The topic of the paper is interesting and the methodology used in the paper is acceptable.**

**The abstract part of the paper includes some subtitles and it doesn't fit to the journal abstract way. The conclusion part is short and it should be developed. Moreover the references used in the paper are unfortunately not sufficient. I believe there should be more research papers to be benefited. After making these revisions this paper can be published.**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**The abstract part of the paper includes some subtitles and it doesn't fit to the journal abstract way. The conclusion part is short and it should be developed. Moreover the references used in the paper are unfortunately not sufficient. I believe there should be more research papers to be benefited. After making these revisions this paper can be published.**

