



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_29675
Title of the Manuscript:	Ergonomics Workstation Assessment of Musculoskeletal Disorders in University of Port Harcourt
Type of the Article	Original 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>)



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	Good study however, you need to pay attention to a few things highlighted below 1) Is this a comparative study? Are you comparing manifestation of MSDs among students and other workers? 2) There is so much of repetition especially under methodology, analysis and the results & discussion section please revise that. 3) Line 11 discomforts 4) Line 12 revise sentence check across No. 3.... 5) Line 17 to read at the university 6) Line 21.....receiving lectures... 7) Line 31 MSDs should be written in full if used at the beginning of sentence 8) Line 54 check spacing 9) Lines 94-115 contents under participants and questionnaire must be written in reported speech 10) Line 116-122 Why was pretesting done on the same population where the actual study was done??? Rules of the game you don't want to contaminate your sample so you do pre testing using another population which has similar characteristics....change this statements 11) Line 116 prolonged sitting 12) 204 reported speech	1) The aim of the study is state in the abstract and the justification in the introduction. It is more of cause-effect relationship. Workstation as the cause while MSDs stands for the effect. 2) The original manuscript has been revised and also expanded to accommodate additional statistical data analyses. Repetition is checked but where it becomes necessary to emphasize a point, we can accommodate it. 3) Suggested correction effected and highlighted in yellow. 4) Suggested correction effected and highlighted in yellow. 5) Suggested correction effected and highlighted in yellow. 6) Suggested correction effected and highlighted in yellow. 7) Suggested correction effected and highlighted in yellow. 8) Suggested correction effected and highlighted in yellow. 9) The affected lines have been put in reported speech and highlighted in yellow. 10) Suggested correction effected and highlighted in yellow. 11) Suggested correction effected and highlighted in yellow.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	13) Apart the section under staff and students shoulder aches, you have not made reference to any literature in comparison with your findings, hence your discussion is purely based on your personal opinions but what is the case elsewhere are similarities or differences? Check and factor that in.. 14) Reference style and list is inconsistent. Check use of punctuations too. 15) Line 314 Google is a search engine????	12) Suggested correction effected and highlighted in yellow. 13) Suggested correction effected and highlighted in yellow. 14) Suggested correction effected and highlighted in yellow. 15) Suggested correction effected and highlighted in yellow.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		