

Review of: "Knowledge among Health care workers (HCWs) regarding biomedical waste management (BMW) during COVID-19 Pandemic"

Marwa Zalat

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Title: Knowledge among Health care workers (HCWs) regarding biomedical waste management (BMW) during COVID-19 Pandemic.

Thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript. Unfortunately, this manuscript has many pitfalls which need major revision.

Comments in the article which needs clarification, rewrites and/or additional information

<u>Title</u>: better to be 'knowledge and attitude regarding bio-medical waste management among healthcare workers during COVID-19 Pandemic

Abstract:

- Cross- sectional study in prospective design: remove the word prospective as cross sectional study assesses
 exposure and outcome a one point or period of time, there is no prospective or retrospective follow up (an
 observational cross sectional study is enough)
- From different research papers: Replace the word papers with studies.
- There was a significant difference is mean knowledge score of postgraduate nurses who had a higher mean knowledge score compared to undergraduates <u>having a mean knowledge score</u>: did the author missed here the word<u>lower</u> before mean score of undergraduate?

<u>Introduction:</u> The purpose of <u>BMW</u>: write the full sentence "<u>biomedical waste management</u>" <u>before the abbreviation</u> as it appears for the first time in the text, then you can use the abbreviation directly.

Objectives: To study the knowledge and attitude or study knowledge only, please clarify

Methods:

- Study population: demonstrate from where they selected ?, All the staff working in the selected areas (what are these



selected areas? how they were recruited to the study?, what about the sample size, sampling technique?

- Study tool: where is the tool for studying the attitude.
- Assess the knowledge of Health care workers. Write the component of the questionnaire that measure the knowledge,
 from where were adapted? Mention references, what about the validity and reliability of the questionnaire?
- Where is the ethical committee approval? And consent of participants, data management and statistical analysis?

Results:

- Table 1, figure 1: are duplication for the same data, the author should choose one only either the table or graph.
- Table 2, 3, 4, 5: can be merged together in one table.
- · What about the tables for measuring attitude?
- Where are the result comments on tables?

Discussion: very short, insufficient need to be rewired with justification of the results

Qeios ID: 5KB7V3 · https://doi.org/10.32388/5KB7V3