



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The topic suggests that the author(s) set out to determine prevalence of MSDs and its association (correlation) with ergonomic workstation as suggested by the aim in the abstract. Unfortunately, the study lost focus to this set out goal. This is a cross sectional study; therefore causer-effect relation cannot be drawn. However, I have the following suggestions with view to improve the manuscript: Abstract 1. Change 3NO. to three (line 12) 2. Your analysis does not support this result (lines 15-18). You may wish to perform correlation or association analysis. Introduction 1. Some statements need referencing (lines 31-32, 47-50) 2. Conclude the introduction with justification for the study 3. What are the aims of the study? This is missing in your introduction. Be specific and focus about your aim(s). Is your study about awareness or assessment of ergonomic workstation? Is it to assess MSDs and its associated factors? Methods 1. Delete "respectively" (line 67) 2. The minimum sample size to power the study is 400 but you included 278 eventually. This is under power and thus makes results unreliable. You should have considered attrition (non-response) right from onset. However, you may wish to look for another sample size calculation formula that will accommodate 278 subjects. 3. Elaborate your sampling technique. It seems like you	We are grateful for your useful comments. Abstract The aim stated in the Abstract still stands. Cause-effect relationship has been established via multiple regression between workstation set-up and four musculoskeletal disorders (as independent variable), R^2 value is 86.96%. Introduction 1. Additional references have been added. 2. Justification for the study has been made 3. Aim of study incorporated ie. Assessing musculoskeletal disorder and its causative factor (ie. Poor workstation set-up). Methods 1. Suggestion effected on line 67. 2. Appropriate sample size recalculated based on prevalence formula. 3. Sample technique is stratified was adopted to capture academic, non-academic staff & students, yet a probability sampling technique. 4. Suggestion effected. Questionnaire Many options exist in Questionnaire design: we chose the 'yes', 'no', & 'undecided' option. Easy to appreciate if you see sample of Questionnaire in the Appendix



SDI Review Form 1.6

	employed non-probability sampling technique. If the study population were stratified, what was the mean of stratification? Were the representatives from each department/faculty? It seems you merely select staffs and students based on convenience. How come the students were more? The staff-student ratio was not proportionate. 4. Write the number of question (i.e. 31NO., 6NO., 5NO. etc) in words (lines 108-111) Questionnaire "Given that 'yes' is the correct answer, then 'no' and 'undecided' become the wrong options". Can you elaborate more? Does 'yes' to each question a norm? Are the subjects have control that there answer will always be yes to all question even ergonomic workstation? Are there wrong or right answers? DATA ANALYSIS 1. Don't understand agreement you are looking for? Which aim are you trying to achieve? Are there norms for each variable that you compare participants' response with? Any right or wrong answer? You may wish to consult a biostatistician. 2. What statistical package used (i.e. SPSS, excel, etc) for the analysis? Did you use mathematical formula? 3. Think you may wish to analyse for association or relationship between MSDs and ergonomic workstation using chi-square or spearman correlation. Results and discussion 1. Table 1 repeated in words. State only significant or implication. 2. Delete lines 143-144, 151-153. Repetition, have been stated under analysis. 3. Figs 2a & b were not self explanatory. Is the above fig. 2a? Can you merge the two figs for better presentation?	(see Table A1-A5). Data Analysis 1. The agreement sought has been established in Equation (6) highlighted in yellow in the text. See more explanations to that effect in the text. 2. Mathematical formula is used for Kendall's analysis & XLSTAT and Microsoft Excel are used for Regression and ANOVA 3. Relationship established via Regression analysis with $R^2 = 0.8696$. Results and Discussion 1. No more repetition for Table 1 & introductory paragraph. 2. Lines 143 – 144 & 151 – 153 deleted. 3. Figs 2a & b merged. 4. Time unit on y-axis is in hour per year 5. I'm a lecturer in applied statistics (see my textbooks in Researchgate and Google Scholar);your suggestion to incorporate the key into the Fig. does not produce a smart/elegant plot. 6. The cause-effect relationship has been established in Equation (6) with high R^2 value. Thus, the claim can stand, it is supported. 7. Table on Kendall's w-statistic is to confirm level of agreement amongst respondents. Further to the value of the table, ANOVA results are added (Table 6) to validate the difference between staff & students responses, if significant or not. It is very relevant. 8. All items in the conclusion are relevant & supported (see cause-effect & ANOVA to validate our claims).
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	4. Is the time in y-axis per day/month/year? 5. The entire key can be incorporated into the fig. (see a biostatistician) 6. Lines 160-161. Does your data support this? 7. Don't think table 2 add anything to your study or relevant. 8. Some of the conclusions are not supported by your data. 9. The author(s) can do better discussing the results. References 1. The references are few. A lot of work on the subject matter 2. Initials of some listed refs are missing. Watch out for punctuation consistency. Please clarify the ethical issue: The author(s) does not state any ethical approval. Please, state this.	9. We've done justice in discussing the results based on data analysis – regression, ANOVA, Kendall's w-statistic, etc References 1. Suggestion has been effected. 2. Suggestion has been effected and missing initials of some reference inputted appropriately. The ethical issue has been addressed and highlighted in yellow in the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Think the study will be more interested if the author(s) can present the results along the following thought: 1. Prevalence of MSDs stratify by staffs and students. 2. Prevalence of MSDs stratify by body region. 3. Gender association with MSDs. 4. Gender difference or influence on MSDs 5. Pattern of ergonomic workstations. 6. Association/relationship between MSDs and ergonomic workstations.	We've presented our study based on your item (6) – Relationship between MSDs and ergonomic workstation. Other suggestions will be of value for further work.