

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJECC_99474 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | MANUAL SHELLING OF PRECONDITIONED CASHEW NUT USING HANDTOOL AND ITS IMPACTON OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH OF WORKERS |
| 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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) |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>1) Yes, although it should be more explicated in the study.</p> <p>2) I suggest that instead of occupational health, the authors use ergonomic health or something like that. Because most of what was done was ergonomics and psychophysiological measures. Maybe impact on ergonomic and psychophysiology of workers.</p> <p>3) When mentioning "ergonomic parameters like", I suggest: the ergonomic parameters WERE. Not "like". Science is exact. Specify exactly what parameters where used.</p> <p>4) I believe there should be subsections dividing the nutshell properties and the ergonomic/psychophysiology aspects.</p> <p>5) I believe there should be a major English writing revision of the manuscript. There are orthography errors and some confusion: for example, Indian is the second-leading country? India, you mean?</p> <p>6) There are main authors of the area (Kumar, for example) and sufficient updated references. But I'm confused with the format of the references. They don't seem to be following a pattern even by themselves.</p> <p>I'm finding the discussion and conclusion too poor for an article. What do the results bring of new to the scientific community? The authors are not supposed just to plot the results and then "OK, that's it". This is a very nice paper, and they should compare to other studies, to other findings in the literature. In the ending of an article, we want to see an uplift and leave with a feeling of "Hey, let's keep researching this, this is an important subject, other scientist too are worried about that".</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Already said before.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

| | Reviewers'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: | Pedro Augusto Croce Carlotto |
| Department, University & Country | Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brazil |