

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Scientific Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JSRR_113282 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Psychosocial Hazards among Field Workers in the Construction Industry Across Demographic Groups in Rivers State |
| Type of the Article | Research |

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u> | <p>The manuscript is important to the scientific community.</p> <p>The Title of the Article is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive but needs minor revision.</p> <p>The subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient, but most are very old and need to be reviewed.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Many thanks2. Thank you3. The Abstract, corrections highlighted in yellow4. Thank you5. Thanks for your positive comment6. Most of the older literatures used are works from important theories, researchs and books that cannot be exempted while conducting this research as there is paucity in studies on psychosocial hazards and safety outcomes. Such as Goldenhar et al., (1998), Karasek (1979), Leka and Cox (2008), Cox et al., (2000), Sijuwade (1995). These publications are the foundation of this research in general. |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <p>Both the language and quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication.</p> | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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> | |