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Reviewer’s report:

I think this is more of a "cross sectional study" other than a "comparative cross-sectional study".

The methods section section in the abstract is talking of convenient sampling but in the Methods section of the Manuscript it is not convenient sampling, needs alignment.

The conclusion in the Abstract is not in sync with the topic and objectives and doesn't relate to the conclusion in the conclusion section of the manuscript, needs revision and relate the conclusion to the objectives of the study and findings.

Under Results section, HAMs administration knowledge; present the Port A route as well.

Maintain the same decimal places and format for the values throughout the results section.

In, Table 2; the "Answer T/F" seems redundant. The "Wrong/don't know (%)" is confusing suggest its separated or presented better.

Overall, the paper was well discussed and adds to the body of knowledge.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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