



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>Insufficient illustration to justify claim of degree of exposure. The statistical significance illustrated in the abstract is absent in main article to justify the claim reflected in abstract. It is imperative an illustration (tabular form) or forms be reflected to illustrate knowledge among respondents or their level of knowledge to justify any claim of exposure from poor knowledge or deprivation of safety equipment (which are also not indicated therein). It is important to provide evidences in forms of tables or illustration accompanied by outcome of tests of statistical significance to show such claim of believed exposure.</p> <p>Job-related illness as outlined cannot be related to vocation as they have not been clearly specified. Any illness suffered cannot be linked to job in question.</p> <p>What evidence of exposure to radiation by respondents to indicated exposure to radiation by respondents?</p> <p>Tables on exposure are deficient as the counterparts opposite to exposure are not reflected in the respective tables.</p> <p>Reference listing below did not follow order of appearance as in body of report</p> <p>The recommendation on the need to provide personal protective equipment is unjustifiable on the basis of absence of an evidence of assessment of any such provision. Recommendation for provision of such cannot be made when no record exists therein the study that investigation was made regarding such and found deficient.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>These are basically correction to typographical errors indicated as comments which should be rectified.</p> <p>Examples: Under Introduction, line 4: change "know" to "known" Under Study Instrument, last line, change less than or equal to 5 to less than 3 Note comments under Discussion and make reflection as noted.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:



SDI Review Form 1.6

	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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>No indication in the aspect of Ethical Consideration that consent was sought and obtained at participants' level other than statement that "Confidentiality was assured as names of respondents were not included in the questionnaire. No harm to the subjects was ensured in the entire recruitment". This is not sufficient to indicate voluntary involvement by participants</p>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Haroun Omeiza Isah
Department, University & Country	Bingham University, Nigeria