SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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	• **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.**	
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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***A. Evangeline Mary***
Department, University & Country	***Govt. Stanley Medical College, India***