

Review Form3

Book Name:	Disease and Health: Research Developments
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3993
Title of the Manuscript:	Selecting the Safest Public Bathroom Stall in the Era of COVID-19
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: 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. A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript offers valuable insights into reducing pathogen transmission risks in public spaces, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic. By analyzing bathroom stall occupancy patterns, it provides practical guidance for safer choices in high-risk environments and highlights the interplay between human behavior and hygiene. Its findings contribute to public health strategies and emphasize the importance of robust data interpretation for everyday health challenges.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Selecting the Safest Public Bathroom Stall in the Era of COVID-19," is clear and relevant	
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.	The abstract is relatively comprehensive, as it provides a clear summary of the study's purpose, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. However, there are areas for improvement to enhance clarity and impact: Suggested Additions: 1. Broader Context: Include a brief mention of the public health implications of the findings beyond COVID-19, as the conclusions apply to general hygiene practices in public restrooms. 2. Implications: Emphasize how the results could influence public health guidelines or individual decision-making for reducing disease transmission risks. 3. Methods: Specify that observations were made anonymously and highlight the statistical rigor of the analysis (e.g., mention of fragility testing).	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, as it employs a clear methodology to study public bathroom stall usage and uses statistical analysis to draw its conclusions. The data collection process is described, and appropriate statistical tests (e.g., test of proportions and fragility indices) are applied to ensure robust results. Additionally, the findings are logically interpreted, and the conclusions align with the data presented. However, the small sample size may limit the generalizability of the results, and this limitation is appropriately acknowledged in the discussion. Overall, the study adheres to scientific principles and provides valuable insights into public health and hygiene practices.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Suggestions for Additional References: 1. Pathogen Transmission in Public Spaces: o Reynolds KA, Beamer PI, Plotkin KR, Sifuentes LY, Gerba CP, Koenig DW. "The Healthy Workplace Project: Reduced Viral Exposure in an Office Setting." <i>Applied and Environmental Microbiology</i> , 2016. 2. Behavioral Factors in Hygiene: o Curtis V, Danquah LO, Aunger RV. "Planned, motivated and habitual hygiene behaviour: An eleven country review." <i>Health Education Research</i> , 2009.	

Review Form3

	3. Environmental Hygiene and Public Health: <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Pruss-Ustun A, Bartram J, Clasen T, et al. "Burden of disease from inadequate water, sanitation and hygiene in low- and middle-income settings: a retrospective analysis of data from 145 countries." <i>Tropical Medicine & International Health</i>, 2014.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but can be better.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Some general suggestions for improvement include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Enhancing the clarity and conciseness of the abstract and introduction to better engage the reader.2. Adding more context in the discussion about how these findings can influence public health strategies or facility design.3. Providing a more detailed description of the limitations and potential areas for future research, such as exploring other types of public spaces or expanding the sample size. <p>While there are no overt ethical issues, the manuscript could benefit from a brief mention of these points to reassure readers about ethical compliance. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Including a statement in the methods section clarifying that no human participants were observed or involved.• Ensuring transparency about data handling, even if anonymized, to address any potential reader concerns.	

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vannala Raju
Department, University & Country	TRR Institute of Medical Sciences, India