

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_90970
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Effect of Working Hours on Haematological Parameters among Cement Loaders in Port-Harcourt
Type of the Article	original

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:

(<https://www.journalajbgmb.com/index.php/AJBGMB/editorial-policy>)

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 sample size is small. The number of workers in group 1 and 3 are less than 30. That diminishes the power in ANOVA tests. In that case, Kruskal Wallis is more appropriate than ANOVA. The variable that captures the length of the workday is expressed in categories. The authors could have registered the exact number of working hours and relate them with health parameters with more efficient instruments (Pearson correlation). The strata of working hours reduces the amount of information, possibly leading to misleading results. If numerical values are feasible, ordinal are less preferred. The authors do not offer arguments to sustain the strategy applied. Other relevant variables are lacking, as the years working in the industry or age. The association between the workday and health parameters may be masked by the effect of that other covariates. In that case, ANOVA analysis is insufficient and logistic regression approach is more appropriate.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Valentina Viego
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina