

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58438

Title: Awareness, Attitudes, and Preventive Practices Toward Dengue Fever Control among the general population in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia: A cross-sectional Study,

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision ...YES.....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer Name: Professor Dr Dillip Kumar Mohapatra

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 094

Detailed Reviewer's Report

****Reviewer's report** for the manuscript entitled:**

****"Awareness, Attitudes, and Preventive Practices Toward Dengue Fever Control among the General Population in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia: A Cross-sectional Study"****

Reviewer's Report

Overall Assessment

This manuscript addresses an important public health issue by evaluating the knowledge, attitudes, and preventive practices (KAP) regarding dengue fever among residents of Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. The topic is timely because dengue continues to be endemic in western Saudi Arabia. The study provides useful baseline information that can guide public health education and vector control programs. However, several methodological and analytical issues should be addressed before publication.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Strengths

1. Relevant Public Health Topic

- * *Dengue remains a major health concern in Saudi Arabia.*
- * *The study contributes updated data from Jeddah where outbreaks continue to occur.*

2. Adequate Sample Size

- * *Sample size (n=387) exceeded the calculated minimum (369), improving statistical precision.*

3. Clear Study Objective

- * *Objectives are clearly stated and consistent throughout the manuscript.*

4. Appropriate Study Design

- * *Cross-sectional KAP survey is appropriate for assessing community awareness.*

5. Ethical Approval

- * *IRB approval and informed consent were obtained.*

6. Good Questionnaire Development

- * *Translation, pilot testing, and reliability assessment were performed.*
- * *Cronbach's alpha (>0.7) supports acceptable internal consistency.*

7. Comprehensive Statistical Analysis

- * *Descriptive statistics*
- * *Independent t-test*
- * *ANOVA*
- * *Pearson correlation*
- * *Logistic regression*

These analyses appropriately address the research objectives.

8. Extensive Literature Review

REVIEWER'S REPORT

** The discussion compares findings with studies from Saudi Arabia and multiple international settings.*

Weaknesses

Major Weaknesses

1. Convenience Sampling

This is the biggest limitation.

Convenience sampling introduces selection bias and limits generalizability.

A more representative sampling method should be discussed.

2. Hybrid Data Collection

Both online and community campaign participants were combined.

The authors did not compare whether the two recruitment methods produced different demographic characteristics or KAP scores.

3. Only Univariate Logistic Regression

Only univariate regression was performed.

Multivariable logistic regression should be conducted to control for confounding variables such as

- * age*
- * gender*
- * education*
- * healthcare occupation*
- * residence*

This is a significant methodological limitation.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. No Validation Statistics

The manuscript reports

"Cronbach alpha ≥ 0.7 "

but does not provide the actual alpha values for

- * knowledge*
- * attitude*
- * practice*

These should be reported separately.

5. Knowledge Scoring

Bloom's cut-off values were used.

However, justification for using Bloom's classification in KAP studies should be referenced.

6. No Response Rate

The manuscript does not report

- * number approached*
- * number refused*
- * response rate*

This affects assessment of selection bias.

7. Limited Discussion of Unexpected Findings

REVIEWER'S REPORT

The study found

Knowledge positively correlated with practice

but

Attitude negatively correlated with practice

This unexpected finding deserves a much deeper discussion.

8. Cross-sectional Design

Causality cannot be inferred.

This limitation should be emphasized further.

Minor Weaknesses

- * Several grammatical errors remain.*
- * Some paragraphs in the Discussion are excessively long.*
- * Figures need higher resolution.*
- * Table formatting should be improved.*
- * Confidence intervals should have consistent decimal formatting.*
- * Keywords could include:*

- * KAP*
- * Community participation*
- * Mosquito control*

Key Points

- * Updated KAP data from Jeddah.*
- * More than half of participants demonstrated poor knowledge.*
- * Nearly half exhibited negative attitudes.*
- * Preventive practices were only moderate.*
- * Healthcare workers had significantly better knowledge.*

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- * Lower education predicted negative attitudes.*
- * Knowledge translated only weakly into preventive practices.*
- * Central Jeddah residents showed higher odds of negative attitudes.*

Scientific Significance

The manuscript is significant because it

- * provides updated epidemiological evidence from an endemic region;*
- * identifies specific misconceptions regarding mosquito breeding and dengue transmission;*
- * demonstrates the gap between knowledge and actual preventive behavior;*
- * provides evidence supporting targeted health education interventions.*

The findings are useful for

- * Ministry of Health*
- * vector control programs*
- * community health promotion*
- * dengue prevention policy*

Novelty

*****Moderate*****

Although several previous KAP studies have been conducted in Saudi Arabia, this study provides:

- * recent post-2024 data;*
- * district-level analysis within Jeddah;*
- * updated information following recent dengue outbreaks.*

The novelty lies primarily in the updated local epidemiological evidence rather than introducing a new methodology.

Recommendation to Authors

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

1. *Perform multivariable logistic regression.*
2. *Report actual Cronbach's alpha values for each domain.*
3. *Include response rate and recruitment flow.*
4. *Expand discussion of the negative attitude–practice correlation.*
5. *Improve English language editing.*
6. *Strengthen the limitations section.*
7. *Improve table and figure presentation.*
8. *Clarify questionnaire scoring and provide the questionnaire as supplementary material.*

Recommendation to the Editor

****Recommendation: Major Revision****

Justification

The manuscript addresses an important public health issue with an adequate sample size and appropriate basic statistical analyses. However, important methodological concerns—particularly the use of only univariate regression, lack of response rate reporting, insufficient questionnaire validation details, and limited discussion of key findings—should be addressed before publication. After these revisions, the manuscript would make a valuable contribution to the literature on dengue prevention and community health in Saudi Arabia.

****Overall Decision:** *Major Revision****

A recommendation of **Major Revision** should be based only on issues that materially affect the scientific quality or interpretation of the study—not on minor editorial matters. Based on the manuscript you shared, here is a **line-by-line justification**.

Issue	Manuscript location	Why it is important	Reason for Major Revision
1. Only univariate logistic regression	Lines 180–182, Results	Univariate analysis does not adjust for confounding	The reported odds ratios may not represent

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Issue	Manuscript location	Why it is important	Reason for Major Revision
was performed	263–270, Table 6	variables. Factors such as age, gender, education, occupation, and residence may influence each other.	independent associations. Multivariable logistic regression is needed. External validity is reduced. Authors should discuss this limitation more thoroughly and justify the sampling approach.
2. Convenience sampling	Lines 93–100	Convenience sampling increases selection bias and limits representativeness of the Jeddah population.	Lack of response rate prevents assessment of potential non-response bias.
3. Response rate not reported	Data collection (Lines 101–108)	Readers cannot determine how many eligible individuals declined participation.	Reliability cannot be independently evaluated. Exact alpha values should be reported.
4. Questionnaire reliability incompletely reported	Lines 145–149	Authors state Cronbach's $\alpha \geq 0.7$ but do not provide the actual values for the knowledge, attitude, and practice domains.	More detail on validation (e.g., expert review process, validity indices, or construct validation if performed) would strengthen confidence in the instrument.
5. Questionnaire validation insufficiently described	Lines 132–149	Only content review and pilot testing are mentioned.	Different recruitment methods may introduce systematic differences. Authors should discuss possible recruitment bias or compare participant characteristics if feasible.
6. Hybrid recruitment strategy	Lines 101–108	Participants were recruited both online and through community campaigns.	A deeper interpretation or exploration of possible explanations is warranted.
7. Negative attitude–practice correlation not adequately explained	Results 258–262, Discussion 399–416	The finding of a weak negative correlation between attitude and practice is unusual in KAP research.	

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Issue	Manuscript location	Why it is important	Reason for Major Revision
8. Regression analysis limited to two outcomes	Table 6	Only poor knowledge and negative attitude were analyzed. Preventive practice, one of the main outcomes, was not modeled.	If appropriate, regression analysis of predictors of preventive practice would make the analysis more complete.
9. Generalizability overstated	Conclusions 435–453	The conclusions refer broadly to the adult population of Jeddah despite convenience sampling.	Conclusions should be tempered to reflect the sampling method and study limitations.
10. Missing STROBE reporting details	Throughout Methods	Several reporting elements commonly recommended for observational studies (e.g., participant flow, handling of missing data, response rate) are absent.	Improving reporting transparency would strengthen the manuscript.

Are these issues enough for "Major Revision"?

Yes, because the concerns relate to **study methodology and statistical analysis**, not just language or formatting. In particular:

Absence of **multivariable logistic regression** limits interpretation of the reported associations.

Response rate and potential **selection bias** are not adequately addressed.

Questionnaire validation and reliability reporting is incomplete.

The discussion does not sufficiently interpret an **unexpected key finding** (negative attitude–practice correlation).

These issues affect the scientific rigor of the manuscript and should be addressed before publication.

Recommendation to the Editor

Decision: Major Revision

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Justification: The study addresses an important public health problem and has an adequate sample size and relevant findings. However, revisions are required to strengthen the methodological reporting, provide more robust statistical analyses (preferably multivariable regression), report complete questionnaire reliability data, address potential selection and non-response biases, and expand the discussion of key findings. These revisions are necessary to improve the validity and interpretability of the results before the manuscript is suitable for publication.