



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=sd-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	<p>This is a good paper. But it can be a lot more better in terms of presentation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Language; there is a language problem authors must be assisted to write correct grammar. A lot of sentences need to be revised throughout the whole document. 2. Under introduction in the closing sentence, authors have highlighted the study objective and can include a sentence or two to further highlight the specific objective. 3. Is it a journal requirement that the study methods should be presented in that manner? If yes fine but if not, then summarize the methods into one paragraph. 4. Results: these must be presented in reported or past tense. On page 5; is 0.077 significant? Separate the write up for table 4 and 5. Is 0.065 also significant? What was your level of statistical significance? 5. Ensure that each table or figure has its own clear write up and not combining them. 6. Page 5 has figure 1. Check figure numbering on page 9 and 10 and the others that follow and revise them 7. Write under figure 3 has p-value 0.04 where is it coming from? Like mentioned earlier separate write up for figure 3 and table 9 8. Discussion: first sentence is a repetition from the earlier sections. Delete it and find another opening sentence. 9. Do not repeat your results in the discussion section unless for emphasis or comparisons. 10. Can you draw your recommendations based on your conclusions not what you have read in other papers? 11. Is the no weight lifting policy feasible in Libya? You need to look at what can work and is doable in your local setting. 12. Abstract: check your language there too. Under conclusion revise the first sentence and revisit your recommendation. 	<p>Thanks</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We also did proofreading and edited all the errors regarding grammar mistakes., and 2. revised throughout the whole document and rewritten the <u>Abstract</u> and <u>Introduction</u> in proper manner. 3. There is no obligation requirement to write <u>Methods</u> in only one paragraph. 4. <u>Results</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results presented in past tense as you requested. • 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. • Separate the write up for table 4 and 5 was done. 5. • Separate the write up for tables. 6. Figure numbering revised them and edited all errors. 7. Figure 3: p-value 0.04 is coming from SPSS calculations and out comes, we presented these outcomes in figure rather than put it as a table. 8. Discussion: repeated sentence deleted. 9. We also did proofreading and edited all the errors. 10. Recommendations: We adjusted the recommendations. 11. Recommendations: We added the suitable lifting policy in Libya (Proper manual lifting). 12. Abstract, conclusion and recommendation: We also did proofreading and edited all the errors.
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	None.