



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJANR_48637</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices of Nurses Regard Infection Control Program in El-Hawwary Renal Dialysis Centre in Benghazi City, Libya.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Title:</b> Assessment of Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices of Nurses about Infection Control Measures in single Renal Dialysis Centre / Benghazi city.</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b> should be subdivided into Background, Material and Methods, Results and Conclusions.</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> correct the following mistakes:                      1- Spacing mistakes (staff, but/(BSIs)for)                      2- Citation of reference before not after dot</p> <p><b>Methods:</b> Study design: add study time.</p> <p><b>Data Collection:</b> Spacing mistakes.</p> <p><b>Sample Population:</b> change to sample size, remove the study time.</p> <p><b>Results:</b> write all the results of your study first then add tables and figures.                      Table1: Spacing mistakes.                      Graphs: change the word graph to figure</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> rewrite the discussion in a way that you support your findings with former studies agree/disagree with your results and supporting your results with facts.</p> <p><b>References:</b> rewrite the reference using Vancouver (numeric) referencing style.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Thank you very much for your comments. ☺</li> <li>▪ The title of the study was changed.</li> <li>▪ The Abstract of the study was subdivided into Background, Material and Methods, Results and Conclusions.</li> <li>▪ <b>Introduction:</b>                              1. Spacing mistakes (staff, but/(BSIs)for) were done.                              2. Citation of reference before dot was done.</li> <li>▪ <b>Methods:</b> Study design: study time was added.</li> <li>▪ <b>Data Collection:</b> Spacing mistakes were checked.</li> <li>▪ <b>Sample Population:</b> changed to sample size, the study time removed.</li> <li>▪ <b>Results:</b> all the results of this study were written first then tables and figures were added.</li> <li>▪ <b>Table1:</b> Spacing mistakes were checked.</li> <li>▪ <b>Graphs:</b> the word graph was changed to figure.</li> <li>▪ <b>Discussion:</b> I already wrote the discussion with supporting and comparison of other evidence. However, I have checked and edited it in the way that you request as possible as I could.</li> <li>▪ <b>References:</b> Checked and edited them.</li> </ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Nice Work need rewriting of Discussion and reference for publishing	Thank you very much and I appreciate your comments. ☺ Proof reading was done and edited all changes that you ask us for.
<b>Optional/General</b> 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>	There was no ethical issues and applying for ethical approval was made in order to collect the data.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>