

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research - New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2041
Title of the Manuscript:	Surveillance of Biomedical Waste Practices in a Multi Speciality Hospital, its Evaluation and Audit
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This chapter emphasizes the importance of competent biomedical waste management in healthcare facilities to safeguard the population and the environment. This reaffirms the need to ensure proper training and sensitization of all the healthcare workers on waste classification, labeling and segregation, collection, storage and disposal. The study establishes major gaps in the current training programs and stresses upon the need to set strict guidelines for the training of actors in the healthcare sector for ensuring conformity and optimization of waste management practices in healthcare organizations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title effectively communicates the concern with observing and evaluating biomedical waste management in a fully-realized context within a hospital environment and it also states that this chapter includes an assessment and an audit of these practices.	
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.	Replace "&" with "and" for formal academic writing. Revised: "A predesigned questionnaire with closed-ended questions was used to conduct this study on HCWs. Data related to awareness and knowledge about various aspects of biomedical waste management were collected." Revise as follows: "Results: Out of 100 HCWs, 40 doctors knew all BMW categories. 45 doctors and 40 nursing staff (total 85 HCWs) correctly answered questions on color coding. Only 30 doctors and 21 nursing staff knew about BMW transport. 25 doctors and 18 nurses answered correctly about BMW storage and disposal." Improve the conclusion to directly address the need for training and evaluation as follows: "Vigorous and repeated training and evaluation are needed to bridge the knowledge gaps among HCWs."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I suggest the following structure: ☐ Introduction - Background - Objectives ☐ Materials and Methods - Study Design - Study Setting and Duration - Participants - Data Collection Tools	

Review Form2

	• Data Analysis ☐ Results • Demographic Profile of Healthcare Workers • Knowledge of BMW Categories • Knowledge of BMW Color Coding • Knowledge of BMW Transport • Knowledge of BMW Storage and Disposal ☐ Discussion • Comparison with Other Studies • Implications for Practice • Conclusion • Limitations of the Study • Recommendations • Consent	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its meticulous methodology, comprehensive data analysis, and clear articulation of results. The research design is well-structured, ensuring that variables are controlled and results are replicable.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	o Paragraph 1: "aid in treating unhealthy people but unknowingly without people being aware about the bad effects of the waste generated in the process on the environment & mankind" should be revised to "aid in treating unhealthy people, often without awareness of the harmful effects of the waste generated on the environment and humanity." "is a well-known & entrenched" should be "is well-known and entrenched." o Paragraph 2: "is non- risk in nature" should be "is non-risk in nature." "A valid & sound way of tackling" should be "A valid and sound way of tackling." "Theoretically precarious" should be "inherently hazardous." o Paragraph 3: "Haphazard disposal of Biomedical waste and exposure to such an irresponsibly disposed waste carries a grave menace" should be "Haphazard disposal of biomedical waste and exposure to irresponsibly disposed waste pose a grave threat." "It is statutory that appropriate pre-treatment is carried out on the biomedical waste prior to its final disposal" should be "It is mandatory that appropriate pre-treatment is carried out on biomedical waste prior to its final disposal." o Paragraph 4: "10% of all fatal/life-threatening diseases in the South-East Asia region is attributed to the Hospital-acquired infections" should be "10% of all fatal or life-threatening diseases in the South-East Asia region are attributed to hospital-acquired infections." o Paragraph 5: "rules may be called BMW Rules 2016" should be "rules are referred to as the BMW Rules 2016."	
Optional/General comments	o Introduction: Emphasize the importance of biomedical waste management in the context of public health and environmental safety. Provide a brief overview of the chapter's structure. o Methods: Clarify the study design, particularly the sampling method and the rationale behind the chosen hospital and participants. Specify the statistical methods used for data analysis in more detail. o Results and Discussion: Separate the results from the discussion for clarity. Provide a more detailed interpretation of the findings and compare them with existing literature. o Conclusion: Summarize the key findings succinctly. Offer clear recommendations based on the study results.	

Review Form2

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Martha Chadyiwa
Department, University & Country	University of Johannesburg , South Africa