

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJRNH_100988  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | A pre-experimental study to assess the effectiveness of computer assisted teaching programme on knowledge regarding nosocomial infection and it's prevention among b.sc nursing 1st year students of alamdardar memorial college of nursing and medical technology, charar-i-sharief , budgam” |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?<br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?<br/>(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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>Yes, the manuscript is very much essential for the scientific community.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Inclusion and Exclusion criteria was not mentioned.<br/>Sample size calculation should be there.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>  | <p>The dependent variable is knowledge not gain in knowledge score.<br/>In the title of the study instead of effectiveness write effect of</p> <p>Yes english quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>             |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>In the analysis, instead of adequate, inadequate and moderate classification of knowledge score<br/>It will be sound good to keep poor, average and good knowledge score.</p>   |   |

### 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:                            | <b>Rubi Pradhan</b>                                    |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Sum Nursing College, Siksha O Anusandhan, India</b> |