

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

Gerda Gericke

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In my opinion, the manuscript (with its current content) should not be considered for publication due to (i) the contribution thereof to the corpus of knowledge on the topic (i.e., importance of nutritional screening and the lack of implementation thereof), and (ii) a few fundamental flaws regarding the methodology. However, the findings can be used for the development of training programmes (for the different health professional categories/ cadres) on the implementation of nutritional screening in the studied clinical setting (see below).

1. **Contribution to the corpus of knowledge.** Much has been published on the topic (importance of nutritional screening and lack of implementation thereof); hence, the focus in research ought to be on what can be done to address the lack of implementation and improvement thereof in specific clinical environments, i.e., development of training programmes, implementation thereof, and assessment of impact and change over time. The findings of the current study (reported in the manuscript) can be used to design training programmes to address the lack of implementation in the studied hospital.
2. **Flaws in methodology.** A clear and detailed description of the questionnaire development is absent. Was the questionnaire subjected to face and content verification? Fundamentally, there is no clear conceptualisation of knowledge and perception per se (compare to attitude), which is not mentioned in the manuscript. The questionnaire consisted of three parts. However, in the same section (under Study instruments), it was mentioned that the questionnaire sheet consisted of four parts. It is not clear how the open-ended questions, and their nature, were dealt with in the analysis and the reporting of the findings. The impact of the skewness of the voluntary sample on the findings should be acknowledged and dealt with in the discussion.
3. **Strengths and limitations.** The first sentence under the mentioned heading is not scientifically true for this study.