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**PART 1: Comments**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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.** | This manuscript addresses an important and timely issue in global healthcare: adherence to infection prevention and control (IPC) practices among nursing students. As future frontline healthcare providers, nursing students play a critical role in limiting the spread of healthcare-associated infections. Understanding both the level of adherence and the influencing factors in a Nigerian university setting can offer valuable insight into gaps in education, training, and clinical supervision. However, while the topic is highly relevant, the study needs methodological strengthening and deeper interpretation to contribute meaningfully to the scientific literature. | This research addresses a critical gap in understanding infection prevention and control (IPC) adherence among nursing students in Nigeria, particularly during a time when emerging and re-emerging infectious diseases pose growing threats to healthcare systems globally. The study's comprehensive assessment of both adherence levels and influencing factors among 222 nursing students provides valuable baseline data that was previously lacking in the Nigerian healthcare education context. The findings reveal that while nursing students demonstrate high overall adherence to IPC measures (mean score 3.11±1.04), there are concerning gaps in specific practices such as needle recapping, reuse of disposable equipment, and proper hand hygiene protocols that could compromise patient and healthcare worker safety. This study contributes to the broader global understanding of IPC compliance in healthcare education settings, offering comparative data that can inform best practices across different healthcare systems, particularly in resource-limited settings where similar challenges may exist. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title is mostly appropriate but could be refined for clarity and flow.  **Suggested alternative:**  **"Assessment of Adherence to Infection Prevention and Control Measures Among Nursing Students at**  **Rivers State University, Nigeria"**  This version improves readability and specifies the location more clearly. | Title has been approved by the University research commottee |
| **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 abstract includes the study design, methodology, and results but is overly wordy and occasionally unclear. suggest:  ● **Condensing the background** and avoiding generic statements such as “infection has been a cause of demise for centuries.”  ● **Clarifying the main findings and implications**, especially the non-significant correlation.  ● Emphasize the key concern: the reported high adherence despite the presence of known influencing factors, and the implication that self-reporting may not reflect actual behavior. | Corrected on the attached copy |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The manuscript is scientifically relevant but has several **critical limitations**:  ● The use of **self-reported behavior** without observational validation weakens the conclusions.  ● The **instrument design** (using two different Likert scales in the same tool) is questionable and not fully justified.  ● The **interpretation of non-significant results** lacks critical insight and overstates weak correlations.  ● Risky practices like needle recapping were identified but not adequately discussed.  Overall, the study needs significant revision to be considered scientifically robust. | Corrected on the attached copy |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Most references are relevant and include a mix of local and international sources. However: | Corrected on the attached copy |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | ● Some key references (e.g., WHO and CDC IPC guidelines) should be more prominently cited, especially when discussing standard precautions.  ● A more recent global IPC compliance review (e.g., WHO 2022 Global IPC Report) would strengthen the background and discussion.  ● Consider referencing systematic reviews or meta-analyses on IPC adherence in LMICs for a broader context. |  |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The language requires **substantial revision**. While the meaning is mostly understandable, the manuscript is filled with **long, repetitive, and grammatically awkward sentences**. Several sections contain unclear phrasing, inconsistent verb tenses, and misused words. A professional language edit or review by a fluent English academic is strongly recommended to meet the standards of scholarly publication. |  |
| **Optional/General** comments | **•** The topic is relevant, timely, and of clear public health importance.  • The study uses a full census sample and attempts to answer a meaningful research question.  • However, there are critical issues in the methodology (e.g., self-report limitations, tool design), weak interpretation of key findings, and underdeveloped discussion on unsafe practices like needle recapping.  • The writing also needs substantial revision to meet publication standards.  • The manuscript has potential but requires deep revisions to strengthen its scientific and academic quality. See the attachment |  |
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| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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)* |  |