

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.	The article is appropriate in terms of content, contributes to the field and the country in which the study is carried out, and is therefore suitable for publication.Quality indicators are of significant importance in all areas of healthcare, serving as a valuable tool for quality improvement. It is therefore evident that the subject matter of this article remains at the forefront of current debate.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	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 comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The article is suitable in terms of content. However, the findings are repeated in the discussion and conclusion sections. especially the conclusion section should be summarised and reorganised without repetition. only the findings are included in the discussion section. It is recommended to make comparisons with similar studies. The same data are shown in both tables and figures, it is sufficient to have only one to avoid confusion. abbreviations are used in the article without explanation, e.g. GICU, MICU. it is recommended to write the full name first and then abbreviate	
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.	The method section should include information such as the inclusion and exclusion criteria, the study population, and how 165 people were identified.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	References should be revised. In the text, the author's name is presented in some places and numerical notation in others. There are 16 references, but there are 4 numerical references for the text, and the year is not specified in most references. The sources with the year belong to 2014-2015. More recent sources, especially from the last 5 years, are recommended.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	¶ Suitable	
Optional/General comments	I think it will contribute to the field	

Review Form2

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:	Hatice Esen Koc
Department, University & Country	Antalya Training and Research Hospital, Türkiye