

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

Jane W. Muchiri¹

¹ University of Pretoria

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript.

The manuscript addresses an important aspect of the nutrition care process focusing on nutrition screening and health professionals who are key players in the implementation. The authors are congratulated for the extensive work done.

1. Title: The title is quite catchy and attractive. But after reading the manuscript, I think it does not accurately capture the content. In my view the authors did not assess knowledge per se. There are no knowledge questions in Table 2, probably awareness. To me awareness is not equivalent with knowledge. However, some aspects of practice were assessed. It is advised that the title be changed to reflect what was done.

Consider "Perceptions, practices and challenges of implementing NS: a survey ...

1. Abstract: Add how the sample of HCP was obtained, the tool used to collect data and how data were analysed. Other aspects to improve clarity are added as comments in the document.
2. Introduction: The authors given adequate context to the study. Some sentences need rephrasing to improve clarity.
3. Methods:
 - Add information on when the study was done (month(s) and year).
 - Probably use sub-title "data collection" instead of study instruments because this includes the study instruments and how the data were managed after collection
 - It would be more appropriate to give more details of the questionnaire for parts B & C here instead of under the results. e.g Part B consisted of 9 questions for which the participants were supposed to respond Yes, No or unsure. Part C contained 5 questions for which participants had to respond on a five-point Likert scale from "1 = strongly disagree" to "5 = strongly agree". Part C also had multiple-choice questions and open-ended questions.
 - Reference 15 in the last sentence of the first paragraph in the study instrument section appears misplaced.
 - Participant sampling "convenience sampling" should not be reported under instrument. It would better be placed under subjects
 - It may be better to use a broader title such as "Ethical considerations" instead of ethical approval. This will allow you to report all aspects including ethical approval, informed consent and other aspects like informing participants about the

details of the study, e.g “informing them that participation is voluntary” and obtaining informed consent

- Mention how validity and reliability of the data was ensured. For example, was data collection tool pre-tested?

1. Result

- It is probably not necessary to give the number & % because the reader can see from the Table. Alternately, if you still want to show numbers it is better to put it (n=92, 89%)
- In Table 1, Characteristic may be more appropriate to use than "Factors". The title in the second column does not reflect the content in the column. It would be better to put the content under the sociodemographic factor e.g

Age (year)

<30

31-40

41-50

51-60

In third column, proportion is in both numbers (n) and %. It may be useful to put it as n (%) and you present the data in one column e.g for age for the age < 30 47 (45.7)

- Fourth sentence below Table 1. Correct. It should be Less than half (42.2%) not half.
- The content of the questions in Table 2 looks more of awareness and practice than knowledge. Knowledge for example on tools to use and when to use would have asked participants to name the tools. It would be good to add HCP in the table title
- Table 3: Add HCP to the title . Again, the questions in this section are not addressing knowledge but perceptions and attitudes. Consider making the categories fewer to make it easy for the reader e.g. Strongly disagree/Disagree, Neutral and Strongly agree/Agree
- Table 4: The first two questions are asking about practice while the title is challenges which is only addressed in the last question. Consider probably having practice results separately.

1. Discussion: As earlier mentioned, the authors did not assess knowledge per se. There will be need to adjust the discussion to align with what was done. Although most of the other content are aligned to the objectives/results of the study. There also need to present the discussion in a clearer manner, there are a number of instances of unclear content. Some of the literature used in the discussion is from old studies e.g 2002, It is encouraged if authors use more recent literature if possible, or at least acknowledge that the results seen in their study were seen in studies conducted over 15 years indicating the situation has not changed over the years
2. Strengths and limitations: This statement in the first sentence is inaccurate because the authors did not assess outcomes related to NS, only HCPs awareness, perceptions and a bit of practice regarding NS. You could possibly say the findings contribute to the knowledge base on NS which is limited in Malaysia. Also there is a difference between

strength of study and significance (contribution of the study/benefits). I think the sentence starting with hence is more of significance than strength. Kindly identify other strengths. Rephrase the content on limitations to improve clarity on intended message.

3. Reference list: There seems to be characters after the reference number for example ^ in numbers 1-3 and (a,b) in reference number 4. Not sure this is how it should be done?
4. General: The manuscript can benefit from language editing: some issues related to tense and sentence construction and flow of information were noted (see comments on the manuscript).