



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_46597
Title of the Manuscript:	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.
Type of the Article	Systematic Review Protocol

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>)

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>Abstract: Keywords, descriptors or mesh therms?</p> <p>The Cochrane Library database was not used as a search source.</p> <p>The systematic review recommends further search for grey literature (see PRISMA)</p> <p>I suggest bringing GRADE (http://w ww.gradeworkinggroup.org/) to the synthesis of the quality of the evidence obtained in case of meta-analysis.</p>	<p>-Keywords and MESH terms will be used based on the specific database.</p> <p>- Cochrane Library and Google Scholar have been added to the revised edition of this protocol</p> <p>-The authors accept to further search grey literature especially theses and dissertations and the review will be reported in accordance with the guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P).</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 http://w ww.gradeworkinggroup.org/</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Figure 1 is unconfigured, Check!</p> <p>If the inclusion of Trials, consider excluding studies without random allocation!</p> <p>Citing in the methodology: conflicts of interest and sources of financing (if any)</p>	<p>RCTs are included and therefore studies without random allocation are excluded.</p> <p>Authors declare no conflict of interest. This study is a part of a larger PhD study and funding is from University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa and University for Development Study Ghana.</p>
Optional/General comments	The PROSPERO registry gives credibility to the study. Congratulations.	Thanks



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	
If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.		