



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract: Grammar mistakes, Cross-sectional study in methodology, conclusion and recommendations to be rewritten. Introduction: Grammar mistakes. Methodology: How was the questionnaire prepared? How was the Sample size calculated? Minimum sample size should be 30. With such a low sample size, nothing can be proved. How did u do random sampling with such few subjects? What was the total study population? Where are the inclusion criteria? What is your study population? From beginning till methodology, you have mentioned only nurses. But in results, you have mentioned that physicians were included in the study. Operational definition for LBA? Was grading the severity subjective? Results: What is the relationship of smoking and marital status with your study objective? Why have you asked knowledge questions? It is neither given in the title nor the objectives. Only if $p < 0.05$ it is significant. Many results with $p > 0.05$ has been described as significant. 	<p>Abstract: Rewritten was done.</p> <p>Introduction: We did proofreading and edited all the error.</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questionnaire was prepared from previous studies. Sample size calculation: The total study 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>Inclusion criteria; we conducted the data from all participants as they were all start work without any signs of LBP and no female was pregnant during study period. The study includes all workers, who experience one year and more.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We also did proofreading and edited all the error regarding grammar mistakes and nurses mention. We did define the meaning of LBP in introduction paragraph. <p>Results: smoking and marital status are basic demographic characteristics that should be asked about, because some previous studies displayed that individual factors e.g. smoking can threaten them to progress LBP.⁽⁵⁾⁽⁶⁾⁽¹²⁾ However, we adjusted the writing mistakes about P-value. ($P < 0.05$ CI = 0.95). so the result of this study did not show any significant between smoking and LBP.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Methodology is improper Questionnaire is not framed based on the objectives	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There was no ethical issues and applying for ethical approval was made in order to collect the data.