

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_91216
Title of the Manuscript:	OCCUPATIONAL HAZARDS ASSOCIATED WITH TRAFFIC WARDEN IN PORT HARCOURT METROPOLIS, RIVERS STATE
Type of the Article	Empirical study

### 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.journalajrn.com/index.php/AJRNH/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	1) The Authors wrote in the 'Methodology' part: 'The mean responses were used to answer the five research questions and t-test statistics was used to test the six null hypotheses at .05 level of significance.' But: the methodological part includes only two questions and two hypotheses. Suggestion: Authors should synchronize the methodology part and the parts of objectives, questions, and hypotheses. 2) The Authors do not show the mode of answering of OHATW questionnaire. On the basis of Tables 1 and 2, we can suppose that the OHATW uses a five-degree (ordinaire) scale for answering. If it is true, then the Authors should use a non-parametric statistic test instead of the t-test, and They should rewrite the part of 'RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS'.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	1) I suggest that the Authors put the 'Conceptual review' part and the "Theoretical Framework' part before the 'Aim and objectives of this Study' part for better readability. 2) The Authors do not present the OHATW questionnaire. Suggestion: they should put on this in an appendix.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	Ferenc Mező
Department, University & Country	Institute of Psychology, Eszterházy Károly University, Hungary