



## SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_43644
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and Risk Factors of Low Back Pain among Healthcare Staff in Operating Rooms at Al- Fateh Children Hospital
Type of the Article	Short 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>)

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This would have been a nice study, but the author/s use of English Language (especially in scientific writing, such as this) needs a lot of improvement. I may suggest that a third party who is sound in English Language should proof read and re-write the manuscript (from abstract to references) for subsequent submission for review. I was using the PDF sticky note and highlight to make my comments, but there are a lot to comment on, hence I could not proceed.</p> <p>The sample size (23) for this prevalence study is damn too small. The author/s need not restrict the study population to only one hospital. It is advisable to use large sample size for a prevalence study. Sampling technique is lacking.</p> <p>Readers should be able to understand the methodology of a study and reproduce same if necessary; the author/s did not do justice to the methodology of this study. The psychometric properties and how the copies of the questionnaire were administered were not indicated.</p> <p>For a study with confident interval (CI) of 0.95, p value of 0.077 (as in smoking; text of Table 3) cannot be significant as portrayed by the author/s under result.</p>	<p><b>Thanks a lot.</b></p> <p>Regarding the English Language Improvement was done as possible and rewritten Abstract and introduction.</p> <p>We also did proofreading and edited all the errors as possible.</p> <p>The total population (all workers in the different shift) in the surgical unit (operating room) was 23 healthcare staff (N=23). Thus, the participation rate (Response Rate) was 100%.</p> <p>Regarding Smoking ( P-value 0.077) was not significant and we adjusted this point in the manuscript. Unfortunately, it was writing mistake.</p> <p>Questionnaire were prepared from previous studies and distributed into participants and recollect them.</p> <p>we adjusted the writing mistakes about P-value. (P&lt;0.05_CI = 0.95). so the result of this study did not show any significant between smoking and LBP.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The tables are many (nine of them). Two figures (the first and the second) were designated as figure 1	Noted
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes, The ethical consideration for this study is not well illustrated. Requesting for permission and obtaining a letter are difference from applying for ethical approval from a recognized Research and Ethical Committee of an institution.</p>	<p>There was no ethical issues and applying for ethical approval was made in order to collect the data.</p>