



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_36418
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF PROTECTIVE MEASURES FOR WORKERS AT VITAL TEA FACTORY TEHSIL HAROONABAD DISTRICT BAHAWALNAGAR-PAKISTAN
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	- Contrary to the statement in the abstract's introduction which seems to indicate that tea production is factory based, it starts with the crop in the plantations, where there are even more hazards – <i>Please reword</i> - Start the results (even in the abstract) with the number of workers studied. - The 4th sentence in the introduction (5th line) requires a reference – it is a very loaded statement to make without substantive evidence. - In the objectives and elsewhere "Vital Tea Factory" – it is advisable to remove all identifiers 2.5 Sample Size – the author(s) have to indicate how this sample size was arrived at. What was the sampling frame? - It is also important to mention all the processes involved in the factory. And then do workers perform all activities (e.g. loading, blending, packaging, etc) or are specific jobs delegated to specific people. If so, then how was the inclusion of all categories of employees ensured? - Results – If 14 were frequently absent and 50 were "most of the time present" – the total is 64, but the sample size is mentioned as 60 in the methodology. - Second paragraph of Results is not at all clear. Simply giving the reasons for why the 14 frequently absent took leave is not enough. The factory should have records of the total number of days of leave taken and then a categorisation of the leave should include social causes such as child-care, parental care, festivals or health causes specifying the illness. - Results – third sentence of 2nd paragraph is not clear. How can work-related illness have no effect due to the job? - Results – Para 2, Ln 5 – what were the illnesses suffered? Which of these can actually be attributed to occupation? - Next sentence – how was stress identified? Which scale was used? Or was it a mere report of stress? - In Discussion – the entire first paragraph has to have appropriate references. - In Discussion – the same findings as in Results are repeated. - In Discussion – suddenly we see the mention of "workers" and "machine operators" – their roles and responsibilities have to be elaborated earlier in the script. - At least in the Discussion section it is important to	It has been corrected in article Changed in article Reference is given Modification is done according to instructions No. of subjects should be from 60- 50 Workers performed there loading, blending and packaging Sample size is corrected in article out of 64 subjects 14 did not present in factory for more than a week so they excluded from study some workers suffer from bronchitis and nasal obstruction but that was not too frequent and worsen that causes hindrance in their work it was reported by workers who regularly taken overtime and they complain more fatigue, headache and nasal obstruction changes in article has been done mentioned as per instructions noise level and humidity was not measured during the study conclusion has been rephrased



SDI Review Form 1.6

	state the precise hazards faced – Simple measurements such as: What was the noise level at different areas of the factory? What was the temperature inside? What was the relative humidity? More complex measures such as suspended particulate matter, illumination etc. could also be stated, if measured. 16. In Conclusions, the first sentence is wrong - In the present study, the workers were using no or less curative measures to prevent themselves from occupational hazards like tea dust, noise from machines and high or low humidity and temperatures. <i>Why curative?</i> 17. The conclusions are rather too simple – more insight is required. 18. In Recommendations – the first two are out of place, given that there is no description of these in the findings to warrant these statements i.e. income is not mentioned anywhere, neither is clean water or environmental hygiene referred to anywhere. References – Only up to No. 7 is superscripted in the document. No. 8 onwards are not referenced anywhere in the text.	Adequate references has been provided in article All references are cited properly in text
Minor REVISION comments	1. Though the tea industry is not categorized as a major accident hazard in Pakistan, it poses a significant safety and health hazard to its workers – <i>language to be corrected.</i> 2. Page 2, Ln 14-19: Workplace safety and health has a great influence on the productivity of the entire manufacturing activity..... – <i>these lines have been repeated from the previous paragraphs and hence redundant, please remove.</i> 3. In Results - Do not start a sentence with a numeric (14) – use Fourteen instead. Same error is repeated in many locations.	
Optional/General comments	From the comments made above, it is obvious that substantial work will be required to improve the quality of the paper. This may even involve repeated visits to the factory to verify and explain some of the findings. The results from just one factory may not be sufficient to generalise the conclusions and recommendations to the entire industry.	