

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJMAH_105913</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Associations of Age, Gender and Years of Experience as Athletes with Knowledge and Attitude towards Bystander Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation in Nigeria</b>
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>Yes, I believe this manuscript provides some important insights for the scientific community for a few key reasons:</p> <p>First, there is limited research globally on bystander CPR knowledge and attitudes specifically among athletes. As a population that engages in strenuous physical activity, athletes may be at higher risk for cardiac events, so understanding CPR preparedness in this group is valuable. This study helps fill that research gap.</p> <p>Second, this manuscript examines an understudied population - Nigerian athletes. Very few studies have looked at bystander CPR in the context of Nigeria or other African countries. This study provides initial data on CPR knowledge and attitudes in Nigeria, which can inform future research and interventions in this population.</p> <p>Third, the study looks at the influences of age, gender, and athletic experience on CPR knowledge and attitudes. While no associations were found, the analysis sheds light on areas for further investigation. The findings reinforce the need for targeted CPR education and training across demographic factors.</p> <p>Fourth, the study has implications for athlete health policies and safety protocols. The authors recommend mandatory CPR training for Nigerian athletes given their cardiac risks. The data provides backing for improving CPR access and training among this athletic population.</p> <p>Finally, the authors note how emotional and highly publicized sudden cardiac events in athletes are. The manuscript concludes that more research on emergency preparedness among athletic populations is warranted. The study helps build the case for further scientific inquiry into cardiac risks and CPR readiness among athletes.</p> <p>In summary, this manuscript uniquely focuses on an important but understudied population from a global health perspective. It provides initial data to inform policies on athlete safety and directions for additional research on bystander CPR in athletic communities. The analysis of demographic factors also has broader implications for CPR training initiatives. For these key reasons, the study offers valuable insights for the scientific community.</p> <p>The current title of the article is:</p> <p>"Associations of Age, Gender and Years of Experience as Athletes with Knowledge and Attitude towards Bystander Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation in Nigeria"</p> <p>The title suitably summarizes the main variables and population examined in the study. The mention of age, gender, years of experience, knowledge, attitude, bystander CPR, and Nigeria effectively conveys the key components analyzed.</p> <p>However, the title may be a bit long and wordy. A more concise alternative could be:</p> <p>"Bystander CPR Knowledge and Attitudes Among Nigerian Athletes"</p> <p>This shortened version focuses directly on the key population of Nigerian athletes and the main outcomes of bystander CPR knowledge and attitudes.</p> <p>A few other possibilities:</p> <p>"Age, Gender, Experience and Bystander CPR in Nigerian Athletes"</p> <p>"Demographic Factors and Bystander CPR in Nigerian Athletes"</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

	<p>"Bystander CPR Preparedness Among Nigerian Athletes"</p> <p>Overall, the current title accurately reflects the study contents. However, a more compact title may improve readability and highlight the athlete population. Some options could be "Bystander CPR Knowledge and Attitudes Among Nigerian Athletes" or "Demographic Factors and Bystander CPR in Nigerian Athletes." Of course, the authors should choose the title they feel best encapsulates the study.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract provides a comprehensive summary of the key components of the study.</p> <p>The background establishes the research gap and objective to assess the associations of age, gender, and athletic experience with bystander CPR knowledge and attitudes.</p> <p>The methods provide details on the cross-sectional questionnaire design, the sample of 419 athletes from 25 sports, and the use of ANOVA analysis.</p> <p>The results are summarized clearly - no statistically significant associations were found between age, gender, years of experience, and CPR knowledge or attitudes.</p> <p>The conclusions concisely state that neither age, gender, nor experience showed significant associations with bystander CPR knowledge or attitudes among the athletes.</p> <p>The abstract also includes pertinent details like the study setting (National Sports Festival in Nigeria), the specific hypotheses tested, the recommendation for mandatory CPR training for athletes, and the study strengths and limitations.</p> <p>The structured format with background, methods, results and conclusions covers all essential information in a succinct and organized manner.</p> <p>The only potential addition could be explicitly stating in the background that there is limited research on bystander CPR involving athletes globally and in the Nigerian context specifically. However, overall the abstract thoroughly summarizes the critical details and main findings from the study in a clear, comprehensive way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The introduction could be strengthened by more clearly situating the study within the gap in the literature on bystander CPR for athletes globally and in Nigeria. The objectives and hypotheses also need to more directly flow from the background presented.</li><li>- The methods section overall is appropriate, but more details are needed on the questionnaire development and validation process. Information about ethics approval and consent procedures should also be added.</li><li>- The results section may work better condensed into one results section, rather than split into smaller sections for each demographic factor. This would improve flow and synthesis of the findings.</li><li>- In the discussion, relating the findings back to the existing literature could be expanded and strengthened. The hypotheses seem to be accepted somewhat prematurely before thoroughly comparing to previous studies.</li><li>- More limitations of the study beyond the sample size and locations could be acknowledged in the discussion, such as the self-reported survey methodology.</li><li>- The conclusion should offer concrete recommendations for future research and practice, beyond just calling for more research. Suggestions for implementation would strengthen the impact.</li><li>- The references require careful checking to ensure proper formatting and inclusion of all cited</li></ul>	
--	---	--

[Review Form 1.7](#)

	<p>sources. More seminal or recent studies on bystander CPR could be incorporated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The questionnaire appendix should note whether it was based on a validated instrument and could include more details about its development.</li></ul> <p>Overall, the manuscript structure is good, but strengthening the introduction, results synthesis, discussion of limitations and implications, and conclusion would help enhance the quality. Careful editing of references and appendices is also advised. With these revisions, the flow and impact of this manuscript could be improved.</p> <p>Overall the manuscript appears scientifically sound, but I have some critical feedback on areas that could be improved or clarified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The introduction could be expanded to provide more background on cardiac risks and the rationale for studying bystander CPR in athletes specifically. This would strengthen the scientific premise.</li><li>- In the methods, more details are needed on questionnaire development and validation to assess the scientific rigor of the instrument. The statistical analysis methods should also be described in more detail.</li><li>- The results presentation and statistical analyses seem appropriate. However, providing p-values and effect sizes in the results, not just noting no significant associations, would add valuable statistical information.</li><li>- The discussion does not sufficiently compare the results to prior literature or acknowledge study limitations. The conclusions drawn seem premature given gaps in relating the findings to the broader evidence base and recognizing limitations.</li><li>- The conclusion and recommendations go beyond what the data from this single small study can definitively support. Caution is needed in generalizing the results.</li><li>- The references are incomplete and missing some key prior studies on bystander CPR. A more rigorous and comprehensive literature review is advised.</li><li>- The questionnaire in the appendix should be evaluated critically—are these questions and scales scientifically validated? More details are needed.</li></ul> <p>To enhance the scientific credibility of the manuscript, the literature review, methods, results, discussion of limitations, and balanced interpretation and conclusions should be strengthened significantly. Critically examining the survey instrument and analysis approach is also key. With careful revisions accounting for these scientific rigor issues, the value of this research can be improved.</p> <p>The references focus quite heavily on studies from Nigeria. Expanding to include some of these recent and seminal studies related to bystander CPR globally would further support the manuscript.</p>	
--	---	--

**Review Form 1.7**

<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Overall, the language and English quality of the article is appropriate for a scholarly communication in this field. Here are some observations on the language use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The writing is generally clear, concise, and grammatically correct throughout the manuscript.</li> <li>- Key terms like "bystander CPR", "cardiac arrest", and "athletes" are used consistently in an understandable way for readers.</li> <li>- The tone maintains an objective, academic style appropriate for a research study.</li> <li>- Descriptions of the methods, analyses, and results are communicated scientifically and with the right level of detail.</li> <li>- The academic conventions for formatting an abstract, introduction, methods/results/discussion structure are followed.</li> </ul> <p>Some minor suggestions to further improve the language quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce repetition of phrases like "the present study" and vary word choice.</li> <li>- Define any abbreviations upon first use (e.g. OHCA).</li> <li>- Check for any grammar or spelling issues in a final proofread.</li> <li>- Ensure terminology and phrasing around statistical analysis and results are precise.</li> </ul> <p>Overall though, the manuscript follows expectations for scholarly style and expression within this field. Maintaining the objective tone, explaining technical details clearly, and using discipline-specific language in an accurate way will enable effective communication to the target academic audience. With some minor edits, the language quality is suitable for a scholarly research publication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Zohreh Morshedizad</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Florida, USA</b></p>