

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_97527
Title of the Manuscript:	PULMONARY FUNCTION OF FISH MONGERS IN PORT HARCOURT METROPOLIS
Type of the 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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/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 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes. The study reveals an insight of health risks associated with work in a specific population. No. Health Hazards Among Fish Mongers: A Cross Sectional Study Needs systematic presentation, especially in results, primary then followed by secondary outcomes. No. Introduction needs information on types of health injury that can happen following smoke inhalation. Also state the study hypothesis. Methods need inclusion and exclusion criteria stated. Also, a flowchart to explain will be helpful. In results, figure 1 shows only blood pressure data, need patient demographic information as stated in the discussion. Need to present normal blood pressure and spirometry values. In discussion discuss primary (pulmonary function vs blood pressure) then followed by secondary outcomes in a systematic manner. There is a obstructive lung disease pattern shown up among the fishmonger group, consider discussing it appropriately. Need to present advantages and limitations of the study as well. In conclusion stick to your results rather being generic and provide a take away point from it. Yes. Yes. Consider using guidelines/checklist (eg., EQUATOR) to format and write the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Needs some grammatical corrections.	
Optional/General comments	I congratulate the authors on their study. Revision of the manuscript can make it significant.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vendhan Ramanujam
Department, University & Country	Brown University, USA