



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_15743
Title of the Manuscript:	ERGONOMIC EVALUATION OF POST BIOMECHANICAL EFFECTS OF LIFTING MAXIMUM LOADS USING MALE SUBJECTS
Type of the 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	The aim is not very clear in the abstract. In the methodology: It is not very clear how obtained load and frequency of lift, and lifting posture. How was the questionnaire administered to subjects? In results and discussion: There are some differences in weights of materials lifted, even considering the average above ergonomic standards (ex: Pallet Industry). I suggest better discussion.	The first sentence in the abstract has been rephrased to reflect the aim The authors feel that the explanation is adequate. Inferences were drawn from responses in questionnaires administered to those involved in manual material handling as stated in the scope of the work. An extra sentence has been added in the methodology to reflect this Please refer to lines 87-90 The authors do not think this is necessary. The aim of the work is investigating post mechanical effects of lifting maximum loads (and of course loads beyond the standard limits). Some of the industries visited had workers lifting weights beyond the standard limits, and this brings out the relevance of the study.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Review and better explain in conclusion the predisposing to spinal kyphosis and spinal lordosis (line 167),	Though the connection between lower back pain and spinal kyphosis and spinal lordosis is inconclusive and is still a subject of research, the authors feel from the outcome of the research that there is a strong connection between the two. Conclusion has been amended as suggested.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the introduction: Low back pain is an injury that can occur not only at the L5/S1 compression disc...(line 66). In the methodology: The Discomfort Questionnaire application occurred after performing tasks? It is not clear. Table 3 is not necessary. It would be interesting to describe some of the study delimitations. Considering for the selection criteria of workers the strength test and/or aerobic capacity test should be necessary? Alternatively, promoting a better working condition is important. Review conclusion.	The change has been effected Yes. The questionnaire was administered after performing tasks. No new experiment was designed, the data gathered is a result of evaluating the loads lifted (daily) by the respondents The table has been removed as suggested since it is the opinion of the two reviewers that the table is not totally necessary as the scree plot sufficiently shows that 8 principal factors were retained following Kaisers rule of retaining factors.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In results and discussion: Consider hard or very hard may depend also on frequency and work environment, I suggest an analysis and debate. Repeated stress on the shoulder predisposes respondents not only to shoulder tendinitis...	The reviewer should please note that inferences were drawn from respondents as in the questionnaires, the authors agree that there may be other sources of pains/discomfort in the named body parts, however, particular attention is paid to the pains that are ascertained to occur as a result of lifting heavy loads and also exclusively from the responses of the labourers interviewed