



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Details of inclusion and exclusion criteria can be given. Especially how you did make sure that participants you selected didn't had history of musculoskeletal disorder other than work related? for e.g. past h/o trauma or injury to musculoskeletal illness 2. In methodology section, details of duration for which you tried to find the musculoskeletal disorders may be mentioned for e.g 6 months prevalence, 3 months ,one year or current duration 3. Details of permission taken can be mentioned as these are government areas and ethical issues may arise	1. The inclusion and exclusion criteria have been incorporated, see Sub-sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2. Also see Table 1 for the physical state of the respondents. 2. Duration for the study is one month. 3. In Sub-section 2.3.1 respondents gave their written consent while Sub-section 2.3.4 paragraph 2, respondents in the survey were anonymous.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In table 3,4 and 5 (page no.5,6&7) there is repetition of terminology strongly agree SA and Agree A...which has to be disagree and strongly disagree	The corrections on repetition for the Tables have been effected (see Tables 3, 4, and 5).
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Details of questionnaire validation may be explained (page no.4 under section 2.3.2) 2. Study may mention about the ethical clearance in the methodology part. 3. In page no.5 table 3 (WEAP2)-how did you make sure that participants understood the terms "easy reach and maximum reach zones" as these are professional terms related to ergonomics. I suggest you to explain in the questionnaire section of methodology part about description of these terminology to the participants.	1. In Sub-section 2.3.4, paragraph 1, the Questionnaire validity is explained. 2. See Sub-section 2.3.1 Ethical clearance is stated. 3. The extended meaning is provided as a foot note in Table 3.