

Review of: "Knowledge, Perception and Challenges of Implementing Nutrition Screening: A Survey of Healthcare Professionals"

Arlette Setiawan¹

¹ Universitas Padjadjaran

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This manuscript reports a cross-sectional survey conducted in a healthcare setting to assess the knowledge, perceptions, and challenges of healthcare professionals (HCPs) related to implementing nutrition screening (NS) in pre-operative patients. Here's a critical appraisal of the manuscript:

Strengths:

1. **Relevance:** The topic addressed in this study, preoperative malnutrition and the need for nutrition screening, is relevant and significant in healthcare settings. Malnutrition can have serious implications for surgical patients, and addressing this issue is crucial for improving patient outcomes.
2. **Clear Objectives:** The manuscript clearly outlines its objectives, which include assessing HCPs' knowledge, perceptions, and challenges regarding NS in pre-operative patients. Having well-defined objectives is important for conducting meaningful research.
3. **Ethical Approval:** The study mentions obtaining ethical approval, which is essential for conducting research involving human subjects. This indicates that ethical considerations were taken into account.
4. **Detailed Methods:** The manuscript provides a thorough description of the study design, location, participants, and data collection instruments. This information allows readers to assess the validity and reproducibility of the study.
5. **Data Presentation:** The results are presented in tables, making it easy for readers to understand the key findings at a glance.

Areas for Improvement:

1. **Sample Size and Representation:** The sample size in this study is relatively small (103 respondents) and limited to one healthcare institution. This may limit the generalizability of the findings to a broader population of healthcare professionals. A larger and more diverse sample would enhance the study's external validity.
2. **Response Rate:** The manuscript does not mention the response rate, which is important information for assessing the representativeness of the sample. A low response rate can introduce selection bias.

3. Limitations: While the manuscript briefly mentions limitations, it could benefit from a more comprehensive discussion of potential sources of bias, such as non-response bias or the possibility of social desirability bias in self-reported data.

4. Discussion: The discussion section could be expanded to provide a more in-depth analysis of the study's findings. It should discuss the implications of the results and how they relate to existing literature on the topic.

5. Recommendations: The manuscript concludes with a statement about the need for a standardized nutrition care pathway, but it could provide more specific recommendations for healthcare institutions based on the study's findings. What practical steps can be taken to address the challenges identified?

6. Citations and References: Some statements in the introduction and discussion sections lack proper citations to support the claims made. Ensuring that all statements are adequately supported by relevant literature is important for the manuscript's credibility.

7. Clarity and Structure: The manuscript would benefit from improved clarity and organization. It should follow a structured format with clear headings for each section (e.g., Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion) to enhance readability.

In conclusion, the manuscript addresses an important healthcare issue, but there are areas where it could be strengthened, particularly in terms of sample size, data analysis, and discussion of findings. Addressing these areas of improvement could enhance the manuscript's overall quality and impact.