

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_128569
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF COVID-19 PREVENTION STRATEGIES AMONG DIFFERENT CHRISTIAN DENOMINATIONS IN PORT HARCOURT, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	RESEARCH DATA ANALYSIS

**PART 1: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the intersection of public health and religious practices during the COVID-19 pandemic, highlighting the role of Christian denominations in adopting preventive measures to combat the virus. By assessing the knowledge, attitudes, and practices of religious leaders and their congregations, the study contributes to understanding how faith-based communities can influence health behaviors and compliance with public health guidelines. Such findings are crucial for developing culturally sensitive health communication strategies and fostering collaboration between public health institutions and religious organizations. The manuscript's focus on Port Harcourt, Rivers State, adds a region-specific perspective that enriches the global discourse on pandemic management in diverse sociocultural contexts.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>YES</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>The abstract provides a comprehensive summary of the study, including its objectives, methodology, findings, and recommendations. However, there are areas where it can be improved for clarity, conciseness, and balance.</p> <p><b>Below are my suggestions:</b></p> <p><b>**Suggested Additions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Highlight of Practical Implications: Emphasize how the findings can influence public health policy and religious collaboration in managing pandemics.</li> <li>2. Results Detail: Specify key findings, such as the specific differences in attitudes or vaccination uptake among the denominations studied.</li> <li>3. Limitations: Briefly mention any limitations of the study, such as the reliance on self-reported data, which could affect generalizability.</li> </ol> <p><b>**Suggested Deletions or Modifications:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Repetitive Information: The statement about "mean ratings among Catholics, Mainline Protestants, Evangelical and Pentecostal, and Indigenous churches" is repeated and could be streamlined.</li> <li>2. Overly Technical Jargon: Simplify technical details like "analysis of covariance (ANOVA)" for a broader audience unless the journal specifically requires it.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the provided details. It follows a structured research framework, including a clear objective, appropriate methodology, data collection tools, and statistical analysis techniques. However, a few points could be reviewed to ensure scientific rigor:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Clear Objectives:</b> The manuscript clearly defines its aim to compare adherence to COVID-19 control measures among Christian denominations.</li> <li>2. <b>Appropriate Methodology:</b> A comparative cross-sectional study with quantitative methods is suitable for this type of research.</li> <li>3. <b>Statistical Analysis:</b> The use of descriptive statistics and ANOVA aligns well with the study's objectives to analyze differences among groups.</li> <li>4. <b>Recommendations:</b> Practical suggestions for improving adherence to COVID-19 measures among religious communities are included.</li> </ol> <p><b>Areas to Verify:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Sampling Adequacy:</b> The use of Godden's formula for sample size calculation is appropriate, but further clarity on how multistage sampling was implemented would strengthen the methodology section.</li> <li>2. <b>Questionnaire Validation:</b> It is important to confirm whether the pretested questionnaire was validated for reliability and validity before use.</li> <li>3. <b>Representativeness:</b> Ensure that the sample size and selection process adequately represent the population of 100,900 members to allow for generalizable conclusions.</li> <li>4. <b>Ethical Considerations:</b> Confirm that ethical approval was obtained, and participant consent was secured, given the use of interviewer-administered questionnaires.</li> <li>5. <b>Comparative Analysis:</b> While ANOVA is suitable, mention whether post hoc tests were conducted to identify specific group differences.</li> </ol> <p><b>Minor Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include more specifics about the demographic variables studied (e.g., age, education level) to provide a fuller picture of the findings.</li> <li>• A brief mention of study limitations and areas for future research would enhance the scientific integrity of the manuscript.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

	If these aspects are addressed or already incorporated into the full manuscript, the study should be scientifically sound and contribute meaningfully to the field of public health and religious studies.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	YES	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally adequate for scholarly communication, but there are areas where it can be improved for greater clarity, conciseness, and readability.</p> <p>Some sentences are long and convoluted, which can make them harder to follow. Breaking them into shorter sentences would enhance clarity.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> "Findings of the study revealed that there was a substantial difference in the mean rating among Catholics, Mainline Protestants, Evangelical and Pentecostal and Indigenous churches on the attitudes towards COVID-19 and its control measures among members of different Christian denominations in Port Harcourt, and the mean rating among Catholics, Mainline Protestants, Evangelical and Pentecostal and Indigenous churches on the determinants of COVID-19 vaccination uptake among members of different Christian denominations in Port Harcourt."</p> <p><b>Suggested Revision:</b> "The study found substantial differences among Christian denominations in attitudes towards COVID-19 control measures and determinants of vaccination uptake. These differences were observed across Catholics, Mainline Protestants, Evangelicals, Pentecostals, and Indigenous churches."</p> <p>Some phrases could be refined to improve grammar and readability.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> "The study adopted a multistage sampling technique which was determined based on Godden (2004), which recommended a formula where the study population is greater than fifty thousand respondents."</p> <p><b>Suggested Revision:</b> "The study employed a multistage sampling technique, using Godden's (2004) formula for populations exceeding 50,000 respondents."</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article's language is suitable for scholarly communication but could benefit from careful editing to enhance clarity, reduce redundancy, and ensure grammatical precision. This would make the manuscript more engaging and accessible to an academic audience.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ranjit Barua</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Omdayal Group of Institutions, India</b>