



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_27544
Title of the Manuscript:	Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders: A Case of Office-Based Civil Servants in Rivers State, Nigeria
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	1. Abstract is written without clear requisite parts. 2. Key words need to correct. 3. Introduction is poor related to trial area; no important facts (disease epidemiology, complications, correlation with ergonomics, benefits of ergonomics practice etc). 4. No aim/purpose. 5. Methodology: too many formulas; when was study, how was randomization made; depending on what study population was divided to LGA-C and Min-C (territory? age? work character?); dissonance with "four answers and 5 ratings 5,4,3,2,1 (page 4)"; "summary demographic information"-only age? 6. Results presentation correction is needed: doubt about table 1-5 need; legend to 2-7; an appropriate results description is needed. 7. Discussion- no clear findings described, no comparison with scientific literature (office, workstation awareness, correlation etc); some parts of discloser depends to results section. 8. Conclusion- too many, too expanded with interpretation which belongs to discussion section.	1. In Technical report writing an Abstract contains three requisite parts, viz Scope, Methodology and a major finding. All these are contained in our Abstract. 2. The suggested Keywords reflect the content of the study/documentation. The reviewer would have done us a favour to suggest alternative key words he thinks that best reflect the content. In the absence of any suggestion ours still stand. 3. Typographical error on rating has been corrected as 4, 3, 2, & 1. 4. Aim or purpose is an integral part of Thesis/Dissertation, not compulsory in technical journal articles. The Aim/Purpose is rather subsumed in Methodology/Discussion components of journal article documentation. The reviewer may familiarise himself with online publications in different journals to confirm the obvious. 5. A) In Sub-section 2.3.4 "Questionnaire", the issue of random distribution was captured in paragraph 1 given 50 questionnaires each to two Local Government and 2 government Ministries. The questionnaires were randomly distributed for employees that were more than 50. B) The questionnaire rating has been corrected to reflect 4, 3, 2 and 1. C) Table 1 on Demographic Information has been updated to include age, physical disability, hour spent daily at office, year spent on the job, etc. 6. More clarity on Table legend has been effected. Also



SDI Review Form 1.6

		the Tables are presented to reflect on the nature of the questionnaires for which analysis are to be made with respect to awareness, practice and musculoskeletal complains on the part of the respondents. 7. The Discussion takes into consideration the issue of awareness, practice and musculoskeletal complains with respect to the results of our study and more so, comparisons were made with respect to literature (see Sub-section 3.2.3, paragraph 3: a total of 7 references were made to this effect.). You can confirm that please. 8. Conclusion have been narrowed down from 7 to 5 items (part taken to discussion section)
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Reference list only 30% consist of new literature; what relation with topic has 5 reference; Wikipedia (8) unfits to scientific article; what did mean Harrington {5} (page 2) if 5- Paul reference. 2. English language problems. 3. Layout correction. 4. Would be interesting correlation of bad awareness with poor health, relation with age groups or other. 5. How iii recommendation based on study findings?	1. On the References Wikipedia is the source of Figure 1, Paul and Harrington mix up has been corrected and Paul was mistakenly added and has been deleted. 2. The Manuscript has been edited for misspelling and typographical errors. 3. Layout correction effected. 4. Correlation of poor awareness and poor health has been established (see Sub-section 3.2.3, paragraph 1). 5. Recommendation (iii) has been deleted and replaced.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		