

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_104317</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative analysis of the prevalence of musculoskeletal pain and discomfort in truck drivers by age group.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is very important for scientific community because it represent very useful information to the researchers.</p> <p>2. Title of the study may be Comparative analysis of the prevalence of musculoskeletal pain and discomfort in truck drivers. Age group is clearly mentioned in methodology</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive..</p> <p>4. Subsections are appropriate</p> <p>5. Is a correct one</p> <p>6. References are not sufficient. Can incorporate more references</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>QVS:</b> it is small letter in abstract and capital letter in Methodology part. Write it clearly.</li> <li>• In text always use per cent not %. In bract it is ok. It is highlighted with yellow in the text.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can improve the English language in the text.</li> <li>• In the graph use similar term should be used ie. either interviewed truck driver or interviewees</li> <li>• Conclusion part should be of own from the author . no need to mention or support by other authors</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>References:</p> <p>Follow the reference from standard Journals i.e <b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mira Kalita</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Community Science, Assam Agricultural University, India</b>