

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_100123
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of knowledge of Occupational health hazards among formal and informal waste collectors in Rivers state
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:

(<https://www.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. 2. The title is suitable. 3. The abstract requires a little addition with the methodology. 4. One of the subsections (2.3) can be re-situated under Results and Discussions. 5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct, only requiring a minor revision. 6. References are sufficient. <p>This is an important study on hazards in the waste management sector, especially for Africa. I appreciate the effort by the authors to sample 628 waste collectors in Port Harcourt for this study. A few comments:</p> <p>Abstract: The information below which is in the Abstract is not found anywhere in your results: 'There were significant differences in responses to physical hazard exposures among formal and informal waste collection workers to; "presence of slippery surfaces in my workplace", U=38697, p=0.001, "exposure to high level of noise", U=33417, p=0.001, "exposure to offensive smell or odour", U=36284, p=0.001, and "exposure to abnormal environmental pressure", U=21879, p=0.001'. The physical exposures the authors mentioned in Table 3 are: Excess exposure to sunlight, not wearing mask, washing hands after work, working with clean clothes, and not presence of slippery surfaces in my workplace, nor exposures to high level of noise, offensive smell or odour, and abnormal environmental pressure. Is there a missing table? Authors should respond to this.</p> <p>Methods Section: Please describe in Section 2.2 (Methodology) the chi-square analysis tool you used for testing your hypothesis. It must also feature in your abstract section on methods. Section 2.3: This section (knowledge of occupational hazards and safety precautions among waste collectors) appears more like discussions of your results and should be situated under the discussions section. (Maybe the authors can separate the results from the discussions, if they can, and then add section 2.3 to the discussions). Results: (i) In Table 1, the number of female informal waste collectors should be 71 and not 1 (ii) Please check the sentence: 'Table 4 shows that at p = 0.05, the calculated chi-square value of 403.102 with degree of freedom 19 was less than the critical chi-square value of 30.144</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is suitable for publication after a little fine-tuning of it.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Robert Ohene Adu
Department, University & Country	Sunyani Technical University, Ghana