



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_45368
Title of the Manuscript:	OCCUPATIONAL HAZARDS AND SAFETY PRACTICES OF REFUSE COLLECTORS IN OBIO/AKPOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF RIVERS STATE
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	<p>There is a major disconnect in the study with what information is (1) presented in the abstract, (2) presented in the methods section, and (3) presented in the results section.0</p> <p>For instance, in the abstract it is written: On safety practices, 24.0% had good safety practices while a majority of 75.93% had bad safety practices. Knowledge was also seen to have a direct impact on safety practice, those who had better knowledge of hazards also showed good level of safety practices. P =0.000*. Some of the safety measures identified from the study included provision of clean water and soap, maintenance of equipments, job rotation and traffic control amongst others. This was never covered in the article. This seemed to be the most interesting part of the study.</p> <p>In the methods section, it is written: Section D attempted to access the level of knowledge of occupational hazards among refuse collectors in Obio/Akpor, comprising of 15 occupational hazard knowledge questions, assessed on a 15 point scale, (::: S Poor Knowledge; 6-10 Fair Knowledge; 11-15 =. Good Knowledge). While Section E accessed the safety practices against occupational hazards among refuse collectors and consisted of 10 safety practice questions assessed on a 10 point scale, (::; S Poor Practice and 6-10 Good Practice). A checklist adapted from Solid Waste Association of North America (2011), was also used for a walk through survey to access the safety measures put in place against occupational hazards.</p> <p>The results of Section D and Section E were never presented in the article.</p> <p>Quite frankly, these missing results/discussion were disappointing to the reader because they were the most potentially interesting part of the article. The article with these sections more or less became the cataloguing of the various types/categories of hazards for waste collection workers – which is OK but not very compelling in terms of research results.</p>	<p>My original intention was to publish results for just a particular objective, which caused me to put up results for only one objective, but I now understand that my tables have to be able to explain my abstract, so i would either include the other tables which cover all the statements in my abstract and methodology as well, or delete the statements not explained in any of the already provided tables. Thanks.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>There were numerous grammatical errors or improvements that could be made to the article. My personal edits are attached in a Word file.</p>	<p>Okay, corrections have been duly noted and would be effected. Thanks.</p>
Optional/General comments		



PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	