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|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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.** | **The issue adopted in order to identify LBP and its occurrence and prevalence in the nursing community is a well-known and recurring issue in the communities. This problem is very common and has been known many times before, and now it would be better to take a solution-oriented approach so that people can get rid of this problem.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title is suitable but have used the abbreviation of “LBP” which must be changed to full form.**  **“ASSESSMENT OF THE INCIDENCE OF Lower Back Pain AMONG NURSES WORKING AT LEVEL 5 HOSPITALS IN KIAMBU COUNTRY”** |  |
| 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. | **The following are noteworthy in the abstract:**  **-** The full form of the abbreviation of LBP is necessary at the beginning of the abstract.  - Define the different headings of the abstract according to the structure and guidelines of the journal.  - Expressing the duration of the study according to the guideline.  - Expressing the results of the findings of the prevalence and occurrence of LBP as stated in the title.  - The results of the findings in the abstract are not consistent with the purpose of the study. |  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | * Outdated refences: Some references, such as Sikiru & Hanifa S (2010), may be relevant but need to be complemented or replaced by more recent studies. * Imbalance in Regional and Global Analysis: While global and regional rates are mentioned, there is insufficient discussion about the reasons behind these differences. * Lack of Practical Evidence: The article is predominantly descriptive, with limited practical recommendations for addressing LBP. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | * Update References: Incorporate newer studies to provide a more current and comprehensive perspective. * Some references, such as Sikiru & Hanifa S (2010), may be relevant but need to be complemented or replaced by more recent studies. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | * Repetitive Terms: Terms like "LBP" are overused and can be replaced with synonyms to improve readability. * Sentence Complexity: Some sentences are overly long and make the text difficult to comprehend. For example, sentences in the abstract are unnecessarily complex. * Weak Section Structure: Sections like the literature review can be better organized, with paragraphs arranged more logically. |  |
| Optional/General comments | **Technical Issues**   * Insufficient Definitions: Key terms like LBP should be more comprehensively defined to ensure clarity for readers without prior knowledge. * Study Design: The sampling method and error control considerations need to be detailed further. Additionally, there is no explanation of how the sample size was calculated. * Data Analysis: While statistical analyses are well-documented, there is a lack of explanation about the rationale for choosing methods like T-tests and their application.   **Grammar and Language Issues**   * Grammatical Errors: For instance, in the sentence, "The study adopted a descriptive analytical cross-sectional design and include nurses..." the verb "include" should be "included." * Subject-Verb Agreement: In lengthy sentences, the subject and verb often do not agree in number (singular/plural). * Use of Old Quotations: References from studies published more than 20 years ago should be updated with more recent sources.   Yes, the article raises a few potential ethical concerns that should be addressed to ensure compliance with ethical standards in research. Here are the main points:  1. Informed Consent  - The article mentions that informed consent was obtained, but there is no detailed explanation about:  - How participants were informed about the study’s objectives, risks, and benefits.  - Whether participants were informed about their right to withdraw at any time without repercussions.  - Whether consent forms were written in a language understandable to participants.  2. Confidentiality  - While the article states that participant information was handled with confidentiality, it lacks specifics on: - How data was anonymized or stored securely.  - Measures taken to ensure that sensitive information could not be linked back to participants.  3. Ethical Approvals  The article notes ethical approvals from several organizations (e.g., Mount Kenya University Ethics and Research Committee, NACOSTI, etc.), but it does not specify: Whether these approvals were comprehensive, covering all stages of the research (e.g., recruitment, data collection, publication).  - Any additional measures taken to ensure the study adhered to international ethical standards like the Declaration of Helsinki.  4. Potential Bias in Participant Selection  - Participants were selected based on their willingness and adherence to inclusion criteria, but this method might introduce selection bias, as those who declined participation may have had differing experiences of LBP. This could skew the results.  5. Balance of Risks and Benefits  - The study highlights the need for policy changes and resource allocation but does not discuss if participating in the study posed any risks to nurses (e.g., emotional distress from reflecting on their pain or work conditions). |  |
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