Review of: "Impact of Environmental Education on the Knowledge and Attitude of University of Benin Students towards Waste Segregation"

Shrikanth Muralidharan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Hello,

Here are a few suggestions.

1. Alter the introduction. It seems to be a thesis, rather than a paper.

2. Methodology should include all details right from ethical clearance to method of sample distribution and data analysis plan. Follow STROBE or any other criteria.

3. It is not clear if your study is interventional or not.

4. We refrain from using cases and control terms for intervention studies. Ideally it should be experimental group and reference group.

5. Details such as days of training, severity, reinforcement, assessment of training in between ….all are missing.

6. Kindly improve the methodology and accordingly align the discussion.

7. Descriptive studies provide hypothesis, they dont test hypothesis.

8. Impact is long term, not short term, so it can be replaced in the title and elsewhere. Impact can be for example after 10 years of teaching and training, not immediate. Immediate is just change in existing level of knowledge.

9. The discussion seems more of elaboration of results rather than critical reflection. It can be changed completely.

10. It is quite obvious that a group with knowledge in EVS, will be showing positive attitude, so isn't this wrong to compare it with a group that did not receive any special training in EVS? Kindly reflect on this part also. It is like stating a cardiac surgeon has more knowledge about heart attacks, as compared to a botanist/zoologist. This does not seem very logical comparison.

11. Abstract says, simple random sampling. The method suggests all people were involved. So this is not justified. It also mentions quasi experiment, but this seems more like deliberate attempt, not quasi at all.

12. Before one selects t- test, one should be able to produce the normality of the data distribution, which is missing.

13. In the conclusion- The study identified environmental education as a major predictor or determinant of knowledge and attitude towards waste segregation among residents of the university community, among other factors. What are the other factors?

14. Ideally there is no term called- simple percentages. Its just percentages.

15. Entire result section is data duplication, same section as tables, followed by an elaborate worded description. This can be totally avoided. Data can be either represented as tables, or figures or description.

16. The discussion statement- This is corroborated by Erhabor and Don (2016), who concluded that environmentally literate students, especially in tertiary institutions, are being nurtured to foster Environmental Education (EE) in Nigeria." is irrelevant. You are not fostering anything in the study, while the article being compared is on fostering EE. Fostering has no use, unless there is action. So this can be replaced with some better comparison.

17. Nothing related to planned behaviour theories are relevant in the outcome. Hence they can be avoided. Also such projects are more based on health behaviour models and the Trans Theorotical Theory (TTT). TTT has phases from pre contemplation to adoption; but cases can revert back than moving up. Hence such theories are often used with addiction or other psychological negative challenges. Since we don't have data on pre intervention challenges and levels of knowledge and attitude, it is wrong to state those in the backdrop of the introduction.

I hope the above suggestions help you to improve a bit.

Kind regards

Dr Shrikanth