

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_81279
Title of the Manuscript:	PERCEPTION AND ACCEPTANCE OF NURSING PROFESSION AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN PORT HARCOURT, NIGERIA
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The analysis in Tables 5-7 mimics Tables 2-4 but doesn't make any sense. For example, if one's look at the first question in Table 2: <i>It takes intelligence and hardwork to be a nurse</i>. The mean score is 3.53 and standard deviation is 0.61 with N of 192. So, in table 5 the authors are just calculating the t-statistic which is calculated as $[3.53/(0.61/\sqrt{192}) \approx 79.79]$ which is just answering the question: How likely is it that the score is close to zero? The higher the number, the higher the likelihood that it is not zero. The mean difference column is the same as the mean column in table 2 and 95% Confidence interval is just plus-minus margin of error from the mean. The score they are comparing is from zero but the score is based on likert score type of rating and the score will never be zero so of course one would reject the null hypothesis. There is no need for table 5-7 as this is based on survey and not truly hypothesis driven. 2. In addition the authors should comment on the limitations of the survey studies which is what exactly the authors have done. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Correct the spelling of hearded to heard in the text and tables	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shiv Bagga
Department, University & Country	Mount Sinai Hospital, U.S.A