

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56865

Title: A quasi experimental study to assess the effectiveness of structured teaching on the level of knowledge regarding catheter associated urinary tract infection among staff nurses

Recommendation:

Accept as it is
Accept after minor revision
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	...			
Techn. Quality		...		
Clarity		...		
Significance	...			

Reviewer's ID: JPR-180

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The paper titled "*A Quasi-Experimental Study to Assess the Effectiveness of Structured Teaching on the Level of Knowledge Regarding Catheter Associated Urinary Tract Infection Among Staff Nurses*" addresses an important and practical issue in healthcare, particularly in the context of infection control and nursing education. The topic is highly relevant, as catheter-associated urinary tract infections (CAUTIs) remain one of the most common and preventable hospital-acquired infections. The abstract clearly outlines the background, objectives, methodology, and findings of the study, providing a concise overview. However, there are minor grammatical inconsistencies and repetitions (such as repeated definitions of UTI) that could be refined to improve clarity and professionalism.

The introduction effectively establishes the significance of healthcare-associated infections as a global concern and highlights the prevalence of UTIs and CAUTIs. The use of statistical data strengthens the rationale for the study, demonstrating the urgency of improving nurses' knowledge in this area. However, the section could benefit from a more focused flow, as some information appears repetitive and lacks smooth transitions. Additionally, integrating more recent or region-specific data would enhance the contextual relevance of the study. The research design a quasi-experimental one-group pre-test and post-test approach is appropriate for evaluating the effectiveness of an educational intervention. The use of a structured teaching program aligns well with the study objectives. The sampling method (purposive sampling of 60 staff nurses) is clearly stated, but it limits the generalizability of the findings. The methodology section provides basic details about tools and procedures; however, it would benefit from clearer organization and more precise language. For instance, there are formatting issues and typographical errors (e.g., "Pre-Experimentalonegrouppre-test,post-testdesign") that reduce readability. Furthermore, more detail on the content and duration of the teaching program would strengthen the study's reproducibility.

The description of research instruments is adequate but somewhat simplistic. The use of a self-structured questionnaire is appropriate, and the mention of reliability testing (split-half method) is a positive aspect. However, the paper does not provide sufficient details about validity measures or sample items, which are important for assessing the robustness of the tool. Including information about scoring interpretation (e.g., what constitutes adequate vs. inadequate knowledge) would also enhance clarity. The results section is one of the stronger parts of the paper, as it clearly presents statistical findings through tables and descriptive explanations. The significant improvement in post-test scores (mean increase and high t-value) effectively supports the study's hypothesis. The tables are informative, showing demographic distribution and knowledge enhancement. However, there are minor inconsistencies in formatting and presentation, and the narrative explanation of results could be more analytical rather than merely descriptive. For instance, discussing why such a large improvement occurred would add depth to the findings.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

The discussion, although not explicitly labeled as a separate section, is somewhat embedded within the results and conclusion. This limits the paper's analytical depth. A more detailed discussion comparing findings with previous studies would strengthen the academic rigor. The paper could also explore possible reasons behind knowledge gaps among nurses prior to intervention and the broader implications for clinical practice. The limitations are clearly acknowledged, which is a strong aspect of the study. The author notes the small sample size, lack of participant interest, and short duration of intervention all of which are valid concerns. This transparency enhances the credibility of the research. However, the paper could further suggest how future studies might overcome these limitations, such as using larger samples or multi-center designs.

The conclusion effectively summarizes the main findings and reinforces the effectiveness of the structured teaching program. It also highlights implications for nursing practice, education, and research, which adds practical value to the study. However, the language could be more polished, and the conclusion could be strengthened by emphasizing the broader impact on patient care and infection prevention.

Finally, the reference list includes relevant sources, but there are inconsistencies in formatting (e.g., broken URLs, citation style issues). Ensuring adherence to a standard referencing style would improve the paper's academic quality. Overall, the study is meaningful and contributes to nursing education by demonstrating the value of structured teaching programs. With improvements in language, formatting, methodological detail, and analytical depth, the paper has the potential to be a strong and impactful contribution to healthcare research.