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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**1. For community to be aware the about the bad effect of waste generated in the process on environment and mankind.** **2. To be aware of health hazard and diseases caused through waste generated by healthcare systems.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Title to be edited to read ASSSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AMONG THE HEALTHCARE WORKERS IN … HOSPITAL**	
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.	**It is well written and systematic, include in the results the number of healthcare workers used per category then. Total number of doctors or nurses then results and also include the analysis e.g in percentage.** **Key words-pickfew words that eclude the rules to be brief.** **HCW to be explained before use in methodology again don't use abbreviations that are not internationally recognized, replace biomedical waste with hospital wase or medical waste.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Well planned and good structuring need to edit some sentences like pretty good in colour coding its not scientifically measurable (3.3)**	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**1. Exclusion and inclusion criteria in methodology is very scientific and important** **2. Very good table 1 about age distribution and professional experience amongst healthcare workers, ie good tabulation of data in the table.** **3. Explanation of the gaps in discussion. This gap in the knowledge could be attributed to lack of professional experience of nursing staff.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	**The total number of references are 19 and this is sufficient depending on the number of objectives and the scope most are recent except number 3 of 1998 which should be substituted,**	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Appropriate but should be made more scientific e.g the comparison of data, significant difference or percentage.	
Optional/Generalcomments	Good paper for publication, edit on scientific knowledge rather than laymans language in some cases, eg in results use it was observed.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Susan Muthoni Maina**
Department, University & Country	**JKUAT, Kenya**