

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research - New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1846
Title of the Manuscript:	A study of Quality Assessment and Quality Control in an Intensive Care Unit in a Tertiary Care Hospital.
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I value this publication for its thorough assessment of quality management and control in ICU environments, presenting enlightening statistics on patient and staff contentment. The comprehensive statistical research and evaluation of diverse quality indicators exemplify a meticulous approach to comprehending and enhancing ICU performance. Moreover, the document's unambiguous conclusions and feasible recommendations highlight its practical significance and potential influence on improving healthcare quality.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is fairly comprehensive, covering key elements such as the introduction to the problem, methods used, results obtained, and conclusions drawn. However, some improvements can be made to enhance its clarity and completeness.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure and subsections seem to be well-organized and appropriate. Each section encompasses the essential components of a research study, such as the abstract, introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. Nevertheless, there are a few areas in which the manuscript can be enhanced to enhance its lucidity and flow.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound?Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	There are numerous critical factors that contribute to the manuscript's scientific robustness and technical soundness. Initially, it implements a comprehensive methodology that encompasses the use of quality indicators, a structured questionnaire, and statistical analysis (chi-square test) to identify significant associations, thereby guaranteeing the reliability and validity of the results. The generalizability of the results is improved by the inclusion of 165 participants, including ICU staff, patients, and their attendants. The sample size is sufficient. Furthermore, the investigation considers a variety of quality management practices, patient satisfaction, and staff knowledge, in order to offer a comprehensive assessment of the ICU's performance. Finally, the conclusions drawn are substantiated by the results, which are presented with clear statistical significance, thereby ensuring that the study's findings are founded on solid empirical evidence.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.		

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bung Hui Na
Department, University & Country	Hospital Sibul, Malaysia