



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_AJRNH_46597</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Effect of Patient-centred Care on Quality Nursing Care, Nurse-sensitive indicators and Satisfaction of Nurses and Patients in Adult Medical Inpatients Setting: a mixed methods systematic review protocol.</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Systematic Review Protocol</b>  |

**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>)

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>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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)  |
|--|---|---|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments |   |   |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      | <p><b>Effect of Patient-centred Care on Quality Nursing Care, Nurse-sensitive indicators and Satisfaction of Nurses and Patients in Adult Medical Inpatients Setting: a mixed methods systematic review protocol.</b></p> <p>It was a pleasure for me to check this paper.<br/>I read through this manuscript and I think that this is a good paper.<br/>Consequently, I congratulate the authors.<br/>But I suggest that, please, review the following comments:</p> <p><b>-Method:</b><br/>-Do you not include "gray" or "opaque" literature (technical reports, conference proceedings and dissertations)?</p> <p>-There is little more information about validity (internal validity: refers to the ability to avoid systematic errors or biases through the design and conduct of the study, while external validity is related to the applicability of the results to a specific population.)</p> <p>-Why not use a system to inform the quality and strength of the recommendation, such as the GRADE system? (It indicates how much we can trust that the estimate of the effect of the intervention is correct and how much we can trust that the implementation of the recommendation will bring more benefits than risks).</p> <p>-It would be worthwhile to comment more on the determination of heterogeneity and the analysis of subgroups (it is often interesting to examine a special category of participants in the review (for example, women, a group of age or the severity of the disease)).</p> | <p>-Thank you</p> <p>-Grey literature such as dissertations and thesis will be included in the revised protocol and google scholar will also be searched for grey literature.</p> <p>-The processes of data search, extraction and synthesis will be done by two independent reviewers and differences resolved by a third reviewer, the leader of the team.</p> <p>-The quality of papers will be assessed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) – Version 2011. The quality of meta-analysis will be assessed using the GRADE tool (<a href="http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/">http://w ww.gradeworkinggroup.org/</a>).</p> <p>-We will conduct an assessment of heterogeneity to confirm our expectation by adopting the method of Whitehead et al [1], methodological heterogeneity will be determined by comparing the findings of the different study designs of the included studies, and the outcome discussed among the review team to arrive at a consensus.</p> <p>-This study plans to avoid publication bias by using a mixed method approach</p> |



|                                  |   |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
|                                  | <p>-It would be worth commenting more on the determination of the publication bias (the information collection must be exhaustive, both published and unpublished studies to avoid incurring in selection bias).</p> <p><b>-References:</b><br/>The references should be quoted, numerically, in the text in correlative order.<br/>Review, please, the rules of the Journal.<br/>The abbreviations of journals should conform to those of the US National Library of Medicine for Medline / PubMed (available in:<br/><a href="https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals">https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals</a><br/>For example:<br/>Journal of advanced nursing. NLM Title Abbreviation: J Adv Nurs</p> | <p>to include qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods patient-centred care studies. Both Published and grey literature especially theses and dissertations will be included.</p> <p>-Recognizing the fact that studies with statistically significant (<math>p&lt;0.05</math>) findings are more likely to be published than those with non-significant findings [2-4]; we will evaluate publication bias using funnel plots and assessment of funnel plot asymmetry, if applicable. This method has been widely used previously [1, 3, 5, 6] and recommended to investigate publication bias [7]. In order to assess reporting bias from RCTs, we will evaluate the time of publication of the trial protocol and recruitment of patients. For trials published after 1<sup>st</sup> July 2005; the Clinical Trial Register at the International Clinical Trials Registry Platform of the World Health Organization will be screened. We will compare the outcomes specified in the protocol against those in the published report, to assess selective outcome reporting bias.</p> <p>References are corrected to reflect the Vancouver referencing style.</p> |
| <b>Optional/General</b> 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) |   |
| If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links. |   |   |

References

- Whitehead PJ, Drummond A, Walker MF, Parry RH: **Interventions to reduce dependency in personal activities of daily living in community dwelling adults who use homecare services: protocol for a systematic review.** *Systematic reviews* 2013, **2**(1):49.
- Dwan K, Gamble C, Williamson PR, Kirkham JJ: **Systematic review of the empirical evidence of study publication bias and outcome reporting bias—an updated review.** *PLoS One* 2013, **8**(7):e66844.
- Song F, Parekh S, Hooper L, Loke Y, Ryder J, Sutton A, Hing C, Kwok C, Pang C, Harvey I: **Dissemination and publication of research findings: an updated review of related biases:** Prepress Projects Limited; 2010.
- Hopewell S, Loudon K, Clarke MJ, Oxman AD, Dickersin K: **Publication bias in clinical trials due to statistical significance or direction of trial results.** *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009, **1**(1).
- Turner EH, Matthews AM, Linardatos E, Tell RA, Rosenthal R: **Selective publication of antidepressant trials and its influence on apparent efficacy.** *New England Journal of Medicine* 2008, **358**(3):252-260.



6. Turner EH, Knoopfmacher D, Shapley L: **Publication bias in antipsychotic trials: an analysis of efficacy comparing the published literature to the US Food and Drug Administration database.** *PLoS medicine* 2012, **9**(3):293.
7. Sterne JA, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis J, Terrin N, Jones DR, Lau J, Carpenter J, Rücker G, Harbord RM, Schmid CH: **Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials.** *Bmj* 2011, **343**.