Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_49037**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evaluation of Emergency Nurses' Knowledge and Performance about Hospital Triage**
Type of the Article	**Clinical research**

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	❖ **Strengths** 1. It is an important piece of research that emphasizes the value of nurses in emergence care ❖ **Weakness** **2. Editing and grammar for all paper** **3. Background and Objectives: background: where?** **Objective: more detailed summarized, please** - 4. all nurses responsible for triage in emergency department of educational hospitals of Yazd University of**----** Convenience sample of --- (number of nurses) **Introduction:** - 5. First of all, it is essential that "triage" be defined precisely. In fact, triage is the sorting of patients (as in an emergency room) according to the urgency of their need for care. The term springs from the French verb *trier*, meaning to separate, sift or select ----------(Rephrase, please) - Theoretical background: deficit about triage, principle, stage, and so on **6. Material and Methods: writing according the good research: research design, setting, sample, instrument/tools, validity and reliability for tools, and data collection or procedure ---- return for another research within writing** **Where ethical consideration for research ???** **Results:** - 7. A total of 84 questionnaires were completed and collected. Not need to wright? - 8. Results : description for the table in the text such as table – this shows that- - 9. The level of knowledge of the nurses employed in the emergency departments of Shahid Sadoughi University of medical sciences in Yazd is moderate in terms of triage. However, the performance of nurses working in the emergency departments of the aforementioned centers is higher than average. .(previous text which table?) - **10. Table 1.** Demographic characteristics and the comprison of triage knowledge, performance and total score between categorized groups(n=???) - 11. p value for knowledge shows the comparison of knowledge score between categorized groups,p value for performance shows the comparison of performance score between categorized groups and finally p value for total score shows the comparison of total score (knowledge+performance) between categorized groups. Rephrase the statement and concious of aim from the text ! **12. Discussion :** start by another way such as : the aim of study or one statement about triage and important. - 13. Findings of many different studies are in consistent with ours. In this regard we can mention studies with similar moderate to poor test results conducted in various provinces of (Similar previous study by) - 14. Where recommendation??	Answer to reviewer comment: Dear Reviewer thanks for your comment. My answer: 1. Thanks you. 2. All grammatical and spelling errors have resolved in the text. 3. The background has written at the beginning of the abstract. 4. Have been corrected in the text. 5. Done. 6. Done. we only describe that oral consent from the participant, and there is no need to have an ethics committee code for this study and before the study was begun, the researcher was presented to intended nurses. The goals and methods of conducting the research were explained to nurses and their oral consent was obtained for participation in this study. In addition, the nurses were assured that the results would be kept confidential. 7. Ok, deleted. 8. I have described in the text and yellow highlighted. 9. Has been written in the text. 10. n=84 and also has written in the title of table 1. 11. Dear reviewer you are right, I think it is better to remove this paragraph. 12. We started by another way. 13. Done and yellow highlighted. 14. The recommendation part has written. 15. The limitation of the study part has written. 16. The conflict of research part has written. 17. Some references rewrite new.

	- 15. Where limitation of the study?? - 16. Where conflict of research?? - 17. More than 50% of reference more than 10 years, please checked	
Minor REVISION comments		
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)*	