



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRNH_49352</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessing Efficacy of Stop the Bleed Education</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short Research Article</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>)



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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>I read this manuscript and I think it could be an acceptable text if certain aspects are clarified and corrected. The topic is interesting. In any case, I congratulate the authors for their effort. I suggest that, please, the authors verify the following comments:</p> <p><b>-Sample and sample size:</b> Please provide a flowchart. 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? The authors could provide all the statistical parameters of their samples.</p> <p><b>-Questionnaire:</b> What was the reliability and validity of this questionnaire?</p> <p><b>-Statistical method and comparisons of results obtained:</b> The authors must justify the statistical suitability of the evaluation of the changes of variables in total of individuals before and after vs. changes in each individual before and after.</p> <p><b>-Discussion:</b> 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 (e.g. by inadequate samples, incorrect design, testing erroneous statistics, etc.).</p> <p><b>-Conclusion:</b> The authors must modify or qualify their conclusion of "Stop the Bleed proved efficacious in improving knowledge of hemorrhage control in both professionally trained and laypersons", since with methodological deficiencies (sample size, statistical deficiencies and lack of proven validity of the questionnaire), the results can not be more than a hypothesis to check adequately.</p> <p><b>-Keywords</b> For keywords the list of Health Sciences Descriptors terms should be used (Medical Subject Headings, MeSH) of Index Medicus (available in <a href="https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search">https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search</a>)</p>	<p>Comparison of results between groups is not where the authors want the readers to focus; rather, the authors would like to demonstrate that <i>Stop the Bleed</i> education is effective in all individuals (medical and laypersons) regardless of knowledge level. Sample size was included in Tables 1 and 2 (n = 89 for professionally trained) and (n = 57 for laypersons).</p> <p>Content and face validity were addressed; however, the authors have clarified how validity was assessed in these same lines. Reliability is difficult to assess at this point because this is the first time this test has been used.</p> <p>A repeated measures ANOVA was used to look at difference over time (i.e. pre <i>Stop the Bleed</i> intervention and post <i>Stop the Bleed</i> intervention).</p> <p>Unfortunately, there is very little if any studies out there that address efficacy of <i>Stop the Bleed</i> education. The only study found during the literature review that was similar is the one that focused on self-efficacy. The weakness of this study, as discussed, is that it did not look at efficacy of the education in regards to knowledge – only self-efficacy.</p> <p>The conclusion has been modified to reflect that reliability of the questionnaire has not been determined.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		Addressed in blue after each point.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		The authors would like to thank the reviewer for his/her time and thorough evaluation of the article.
----------------------------------	--	---

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>	