

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

Marco Aurélio Soares de Castro¹

¹ Universidade Estadual de Campinas

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

While the subject is worth investigating, the article in its current form has several technical deficiencies.

Abstract: The abstract needs great improvement, as it does not present proper context and the importance of the study; its third sentence lacks clarity.

Language / spelling: proofreading is necessary to correct errors (maybe typos: '*crises*' instead of '*crisis*'; '*The purpose of BMW are mainly to reduce waste generation*' instead of '*The main purpose of BMW management is to reduce waste generation*'; '*a conscious, coordinated and cooperative efforts have to be made*' instead of '*conscious, coordinated and cooperative efforts have to be made*'

some choices of words are questionable when it comes to a research paper (*living hell*)

The specific context in which the study was carried out is not detailed.

The research gap was not presented.

Objective

The objective section is too succinct.

Methodology section

The text does not inform where the study was conducted and the reasons for the choice.

The questionnaire used in the research was 'adapted from different research

papers was used as a study tool' (as informed in the abstract), but the text does not specify which papers are those.

Knowledge score: The text does not explain the reasons for adopting the score grading used in the study.

Discussion: A large part of this section actually offers some context for the study. While it is desirable (and necessary), it should appear shortly before the introduction instead of this section.

Summary: This section merely repeats the text of the abstract.

References: A great amount of research has already been published on healthcare waste management, and the effects of

Covid-19 on waste management. The article only lists seven references, and that is not enough to establish a conceptual basis for the research.

Final remarks

Shorter articles may be submitted as short communications, but even this format must contain proper context presentation and a clear detailing of materials and methods.

The text as it is, seems to be an outline of an article than the actual, final text. Given these considerations, the text should be rejected for publication, even as a short communication.