Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJTDH_49223**
Title of the Manuscript:	**FACTORS AFFECTING COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARD PRECAUTIONS AMONG HEALTHCARE WORKERS IN PUBLIC HOSPITALS ABUJA, NIGERIA**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Background section.** In this section, the references could be updated. For example, when authors stated: "Several studies have been done on knowledge, attitude and compliance with SPs in both developed and developing countries" it is easy to find more recent references. Authors could update the revision of the literature in this section. **Study Instruments.** Could Authors better describe the questionnaire used and its relative psychometric properties? What kind of changes have been made to the original instruments (Luo et al)? These changes could affect the psychometric properties of the instrument? Please clarify this aspect. **Ethical considerations.** Could Authors describe the modality of informed consent? Could it influence the anonymity and thus the participation? **Result.** Tables are not mentioned in the text and their position is not clear. **Discussion.** In this section, there is the need to find other evidence to support what authors discuss in several parts. For example when they say that: "the longer a healthcare worker spends in a health facility the more training on standard precaution he or she may have attended thus the more compliant he or she may be, seniority also means less workload and more time to comply with standard precautions" I believe that it would be interesting to deepen the discussion, especially regarding the difference among primary, secondary and tertiary health facilities that would help to better situate the related results. **Limitation.** Could Authors provide a reference for the following sentence: "health care workers tendency to give false information"? **References.** I noticed several inconsistencies in the bibliographic style. **Data Management.** Which criterion was used to clean the data collected? Please clarify this aspect.	Thank you. This has been updated and 4 new references added, 4,5,14 &15. The questionnaire has 4 sections and the questions were not changed from the original author's work. They are: socio demographics; knowledge of standard precaution; compliance with standard precaution; factors affecting compliance with standard precaution. The questionnaire is hereby attached. Verbal informed consent was obtained from the HCWs during which their cooperation were sought. Confidentiality was assured and maintained. It did not affect their anonymity and they participated. They have been inserted beside the figures in the discussion section. Thank you. This section has been modified. More evidence has been added to this. The ref. is no 29. The study used the public hospitals and did not analyze the duration and practice under primary, secondary and tertiary levels. The reference has been added as ref no 33. This has been arranged properly. The data was entered carefully into the EPI info template and cleaned by deleting all those with incomplete data. Some incorrect and inaccurate data were validated from the paper questionnaire and either accepted or deleted if incorrect. But they were very few because each of the questionnaire was crosschecked after filling in front of the participant.
Minor REVISION comments	**English.** I think that the academic linguistic tone of the manuscript should be improved. I suggest a professional revision.	Thank you Sir. I have worked on the grammatical aspect of it. The expert we gave cannot bring it out before seven days. I have done my best to improve it.

		Thank you.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript in general is quite objective. The issue of the paper is very interesting and actual. In fact, Healthcare-Associated Infections (HAIs) are a very important problem of Healthcare Systems and in particular of healthcare workers. Thus it is fundamental investigate factors related to the application of the most important prevention strategy as are Standard Precautions. Abstract is well structured and clear and it reports the fundamental topics of the study. The aim of the study is reported and clearly described; Tables are well structured (see also precedent 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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	