

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

Tobiloba Oyejide Alex Omotosho<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of the Gambia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Comments from Review

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a peer review for this article on the knowledge, perception and challenges of implementing nutrition screening.

The article sought to describe the knowledge and perception of HCPs about nutrition screening as well as the challenges HCPs may be facing in implementing nutrition screening in preoperative patients. The study found that HCPs require more training on nutrition screening protocols to be able to properly and confidently implement the NS tools. The study is quite relevant to healthcare practice.

There are grammatical errors littered across the article that the authors may want to consider correcting. Also, the design of this study does not seem to achieve its overall aim. It is not certain that the research questions have been properly answered. There are gaps with the choice of study design, analysis, and research method in relation to the topic. Nevertheless, the study is still useful with certain corrections.

### *Introduction*

- See second paragraph..... "A recent study among medical patients comparing.....from nutritional support". This statement is too long difficult to understand. The authors may consider rephrasing it. Moreover, it appears that the authors used information on medical patients while speaking about surgical patients. A review of this by the authors is recommended.

### *Methodology*

- See Study Location.... "This study was conducted at four wards in HSAAS.....as well as five other departments of HSAAS....." Are the four wards mentioned different from the five departments? One would expect that the wards are under the department but the manner of its description in this paper points that there are all separate. Further clarification is needed for the readership.

Also, the information "The participants of this study were all Healthcare.....Department of HSAAS" written as the last statement under study location is misplaced and should be written under the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Moreover,

this information is duplicated under the subheading 'Subjects'

- See Subjects..... The subheading 'Subjects' would preferably be written at 'Inclusion and exclusion criteria' for quick understanding except this is the title required by the journal.

Also, there is need to provide explanation of what constitutes HCPs. Are they only doctors? Were nurses included? How about other HCP team members that are not doctors or nurses?

- See Study Instruments.... *"The study is a self-administered questionnaire"*. This statement is wrong as the study is not a questionnaire.

Authors used a mixture of present and past tenses. For example, *"The questions ARE self-developed.....which WERE combined"* Information should be provided in past tense.

Authors combined information about sampling techniques, data analysis, and ethical consideration under this subheading. The information should be separated and placed under their respective subheadings. Were there any modifications made to the adapted questionnaire? If there was, why and what were the modifications? If there wasn't, how did the authors go about securing permission to use tools directly from another work?

- Study approval is best written as "Ethical consideration"
- There is no sufficient information on the sample size and sampling technique which raises a lot of questions like: what was the total HCP population even though all HCPs were included? How was the convenient sampling employed? What are the justifications for the sampling technique/method chosen? Did the authors give all eligible HCPs the questionnaire with the exception of those that refused to participate or questionnaires were given only to HCPs that the authors could find? How many HCPs from each of the five departments mentioned?

Authors should provide detailed description and information of the sample size and technique under a subheading titled 'Sample size and sampling technique'.

- See Statistical analysis..... There is no univariate analysis. The authors simply provided information of the data using descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage.

## Results

- The frequencies and percentages could be written out in the descriptions of the tables as (n=92; 89.3%) as opposed to (92/103; 89.3%).
- The phrase....'A significant proportion of participants..... for (50.5%)' is misleading. The result is just half of the participants.
- Table 1 seems disorganized as information is presented under wrong columns.
- The calculation of the frequencies for 'years of experience' is not complete. There are 98 respondents as opposed to the mentioned 103 respondents.
- There is no information that introduces the reader to table 2 so, there is a disconnect in the description.

- The calculation of the frequencies for 'Screen patients using NS tool', 'Training on NS tool available?', and 'What NS tool to use' are not accurate. They are less than the mentioned 103
- The use of "About half of the participants" for 65% and then "most of the participants" for 59.2% is wrong. Generally, authors need to check through the result section and ensure consistency in the use of these terms.
- The available responses (0,1,2,3.....) to the first question in table 4 is not clear. Perhaps this is due to the grammar that was used to construct the question. I recommend rephrasing the question and if possible, adding the word 'patient(s)' in front of the numbers e.g. 0 patient, 1 patient etc.

### *Discussion*

- See first paragraph....Author reported that "majority of HCPs are aware of malnutrition and the importance of NS" but went on to argue against this statement by explaining HCP's inadequate knowledge. Author should consider revising this paragraph. Generally, results are to be discussed just as they are with explanations provided clearly on how findings in the literature compare and contrast to the present result.

Overall, the use of a mixed method design may have yielded better outcomes since the authors sought to determine the perception and challenges faced by HCPs in implementing NS. Using the current design to provide answers to the questions this study aimed to answer would require further analysis beyond frequencies and percentages. Based on the outcomes, there is no information on perception and very little valid information on challenges.