

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_103000
Title of the Manuscript:	NURSES/MIDWIVES COMPLIANCE WITH WHO GUIDELINES FOR HEALTHCARE WASTE MANAGEMENT IN PRIMARY HEALTHCARE CENTRES, ABIA STATE
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrn.com/index.php/AJRNH/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, if results are used for POLICY review and change.</p> <p>No, it should be "in a primary health care center, NOT in primary health care centers because there is only one center studied.</p> <p>No, it provides conflicting information. four research questions and 4 hypotheses, instead of 2 based on the Discussion of Findings.</p> <p>No, Introduction is almost 6 pages, Statement of the problem is so long also.</p> <p>No, conclusions must be based on the two objectives. But, this paper has 6 conclusions instead of 2 only.</p> <p>Cited but NOT referenced (Obayomi and Oyekale, 2017), Pruss, Giroult and Rushbrook, 2022), Abayomi and Oyekale (2017), Department of Healthcare Manila (2022)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	NO. it must be edited.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juvy G. Mojares
Department, University & Country	Batangas State University, Philippines