



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_48724
Title of the Manuscript:	The Factors Related to Using Evidence-Based Guideline in Patients with Acute Ischemic Stroke
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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>The Factors Related to Using Evidence-Based Guideline in Patients with Acute Ischemic Stroke</p> <p>I read this manuscript and I think it could be an acceptable text if certain aspects are clarified and corrected.</p> <p>The subject is interesting and important.</p> <p>In any case, I congratulate the authors for their effort.</p> <p>I suggest that, please, the authors verify the following comments:</p> <p>-General comment:</p> <p>1.The authors write in the Abstract: ... in 1396 ???</p>	<p>1. It was corrected as" 2017" in abstract.</p>
	<p>-Sample and sample size</p> <p>2. Please provide a flowchart.</p> <p>3.It seems that the sample size is calculated for the prevalence, but, was the sample size calculated for the comparison of the results between the groups? What were the hypothetical mean values or differences between groups, power, etc., to calculate the sample size?</p> <p>The authors could provide all the statistical parameters of their samples.</p>	<p>2. Fegure -1 was added in page 3.</p> <p>3.We had not two groups and this study is a descriptive cross sectional study and we the objective is not comparison of two groups. There was not 2 groups in this study.</p> <div>$n = \frac{(1.96)^2 \times (17)^2}{3^2} = \frac{Z_{\alpha}^2 \times SD^2}{d^2} = \frac{123.358044444}{1} \cong 123$</div> <p>+ 5% attrition in sampling=129 Nurses</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>4.The review of the literature should be more than cite the results of other authors. It should also be discussed the strengths and weaknesses of these studies, which should be provided a picture, albeit limited, of the state of knowledge and the main questions on the subject that these studies clarify and left unclear (e.g. by inadequate samples, incorrect design, testing erroneous statistics, characteristics of the persons studied, etc.).</p>	<p>4.we added the new discussed paragraphs in section of Discussion as follows:</p> <p>It seems that in the present study, low level of knowledge in the nurses be due to time deficiency for study in crowded hospitals and lack of Implementation of organizational training courses about caring in patients with stroke based on the clinical guidelines.(Lines 226-229)</p> <p>Obviously, unpredictable overcrowding in the emergency departments of larger hospitals with more than 100 beds and continuous work pressure in such wards leads to a lack of time and a reduction in the focus of nurses on the use of professional knowledge and existing evidence in care of patients. .(Lines 252-255)</p> <p>These findings are consistent with the studies by Kermanshahi and Parvinian (2012)(23), and Khammarnia et al., (2015) (15), where the large number of beds and heavy workloads are suggested as barriers to evidence-based guidelines. As in Iran nursing shortage is an important factor in the practice, It seem in the crowded hospitals and emergency departments (hospitals with more than 100 beds and emergency departments with more than 10 beds), the nurses have not enough time for study and up to dating their knowledge. In this regard, Shahidi et al., (2015) (24)and Heydari et al., (2014) (25) also referred to shortage of nurses, high number of patients, lack of adequate time, and inadequate environmental conditions as the most important reasons in implementation of nursing guidelines in large hospitals.</p> <p>Despite of the result of the current study, the other studies showed that the most of nurses employed in large hospitals had well aware of AIS.(Lines 258-267).</p> <p>symptoms, treatment with tPA and control of vital sign in this patients. Also few of them had sufficient knowledge about the timing of thrombolytic drug administration (15,26). The reasons for this contradiction may be the difference in the number of study samples and their clinical exposure to these patients, organizational culture and hospital routines in applying the guidelines and the method used for sampling compared to other studies.</p> <p>The other important point in interpreting the results of this study is that, unfortunately, nurses in Iran have less autonomy in using evidence-based guidelines. Therefore, it seems that the learning process by nurses mostly is clinical and occurs when the physicians carry out treatment measures. The fact that these evidence-based guidelines are commonly used in specialized neurological emergency departments can be an important factor in remembering the relevant care principles. It indicated the fact that fewer nurses' exposure to these patients in non-specialized emergency departments (hospital more than 100 beds and emergency departments with more than 10 beds) has led to less knowledge in this regard. (Lines 269-280).</p>
	<p>-Conclusion:</p> <p>It is important in any scientific paper to point out the problems that, from the current study, are still pending solution or clarification.</p>	<p>We added the following paragraph to the conclusion section:</p> <p>The results of this study can be as the guidance for nursing directors and clinical policy-makers for designing educational programs and more attention to larger hospitals that have more hospitalized patients. Also, these findings point to the need for special attention to the proper arrangement of nursing staff in line with clinical needs, which will increase the satisfaction of nurses. (Lines 294-298).</p>
	<p>-References:</p> <p>Review, please, the rules of the Journal.</p> <p>The abbreviations of journals should conform to those of the US National Library of Medicine for Medline / PubMed (available in: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals)</p>	<p>The references corrected according to US National Library of Medicine for Medline / PubMed</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> This study was conducted after receiving the written approval of the Ethics Committee of Guilan University of Medical Sciences with ethics code No: IR.GUMS.REC.1396.335. Before starting the sampling, we explained to the participants in terms of the objectives of the research and the data collection process. Also, written informed consent was obtained from all of samples.	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>