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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Greetings I read the manuscript with interest. The authors have chosen a vital topic as a quality improvement program. In my opinion patient-oriented discharge summary for ICU patients are needed and will be helpful for the quality healthcare delivery. The author have developed the summary involving multiple stakeholders and tested it as pilot project. The results are satisfactory. The methodology employed and tested is good and I do not have any major comments to make. However, a few minor aspect can be addressed. 1. Abstract can be shortened slightly, so the background. 2. I would suggest presenting data as absolute number and percentage both in the abstract and result section. 3. A few journal names are not mention as per abbreviated form, it needs to be uniform. Over all the language and presentation is good ad happy to recommend the article for further processing for possible acceptance. Best of luck
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The study is clinically important, but out of more than 300 patients only 9 participated including the family members, which makes it a huge limitation. Moreover, one of the comments from the nurse was very practical as this takes an enormous time. I would suggest that author can provide some data on the use of previous models of efficient discharge methods on readmission reduction rate, improved health status with taking medication in proper time and proper technique (especially inhalers) and understanding the side effect. Authors need to make a case of cost-benefit of putting extra time and effort upfront with efficient discharge, rewarded with decrease in readmission and healthcare cost.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors have made a good attempt on developing an instrument for a relatively neglected healthcare issue. This will prompt future validation studies in this tegrad.