

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_99907
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Occupational Hazards among Workers in Selected Abattoirs in Port Harcourt.
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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>Yes, the manuscript is extremely important for society today, after all, talking about occupational health is talking about the prevention of occupational diseases in workers.</p> <p>The title presents a clear and cohesive message</p> <p>The abstract comprises the body of the text and great understanding.</p> <p>Yes, the work is presented scientifically with all the topics in accordance with the norms indicated for a scientific work.</p> <p>The manuscript appears clear and cohesive</p> <p>References are good and up to date, recent references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is clear, with comprehensive understanding for other readers and for the research source.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1- In the introduction, insert in a few words what are the occupational diseases and what diseases can workers who work as slaughterhouses acquire?</p> <p>2- At the end of the introduction, report the general objective of the work?</p> <p>3- In the methodology insert the type of study, inclusion and exclusion criteria.</p> <p>4- In the methodology, how many questions were applied to the workers? what were the types of applied questions, subjective or objective? what kind of approach, qualitative or quantitative or mixed? What would be the problem at work?</p> <p>5-Still in the methodology, report how the T test and the Z test are.</p> <p>6-In the references insert the DOI of each article and the day of access.</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:	Monica Barbosa de Sousa Freitas
Department, University & Country	Florida Christian University, USA