

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

Kelvin Tsun Wai Ng¹

¹ University of Regina

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 in the competition process

General comment:

This study reports a simple survey study from selected hospital staff at "SKIMS". According to the authors, the study period is one month (Dec 2020). A set of user-defined "knowledge scores" of the samples and their associated demographic profiles are reported. The major concerns are:

- i. There is no meaningful literature review. Knowledge gap is not identified. A total of 7 studies are cited in this study, and most of these studies are not peer-reviewed. It is difficult to judge the scientific contribution of the study.
- ii. There are numerous language and formatting issues. Please carefully proofread the work before submission. More effort is needed.
- iii. Methodology details are not disclosed. Sample size and sample selection methods are not provided. There is also no discussion on sample bias and questionnaires design.
- iv. Lack of data analysis. There is no in-depth analysis. The study also has no real conclusion. A summary is instead provided.

Overall, the scientific value of the manuscript is not clear, and the reviewer is unable to recommend acceptance.

Specific comments:

- P1. Title is misleading. Please at least include the location of the case study.
- P1. "The outbreak of coronavirus disease in late 2019 is far more than a global crises." Please avoid using a single sentence as a paragraph.
- P2. There is no real literature review. COVID waste literature is entirely ignored by the authors. Please use 30+ studies to highlight the novelty of your work.
- P2. Please use peer-reviewed studies from reputable journals.
- P2. "...biomedical waste management (BMW) during..." The acronym "BWM" should be "BMWM".
- P2. The objective is quite vague, and it is not derived from the literature review.

- P3. "...waste management in SKIMS." It is not clear where "SKIMS" is located. Where is SKIMS?
- P3. "All the staff working in the selected..." Please be specific. Please state the sample number.
- P4. The sample sizes among the groups are not consistent. Figure 1 is misleading.
- P5. Please check significance figures of the P-values.
- P7. More in-depth analysis is needed.
- P7. A conclusion section is needed.