

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_113035
Title of the Manuscript:	MUSCULOSKELETAL EFFECTS OF PROLONGED USE OF SAFETY FOOTWEAR ON CONSTRUCTION WORKERS IN SELECTED SITES IN PORT HARCOURT, RIVERS STATE.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Dear research team; First of all, thank you to work on this practical subject. I found your research interesting and valuable but I would like to share you my perspective to help you more probably in this regard:</p> <p>Scientific perspective:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) On what basis you choose these parameters to study on? Because maybe workers' diseases' history, diets, their usual type of shoes that they wear outside of working hours can affect more... 2) Classifying ages are not proper, it was better to makes groups as decades or physically younger or older 3) Hours of standing at work is correct to consider but bending, walking or other forms of activities are important too that you didn't involve. 4) On what basis you choose your questioners' questions? Do you this questioners with yes/no can cover the idea? Did you have a statistics consultant to design your questions? 5) References articles are rarely from recent years (2023 didn't seen and just one from 2022), it is recommended to compare your data with recent papers. 6) Conclusion in comparison with other parts of your paper is very limited. You should open new windows of study for other researchers by suggesting new hypothesis or mentioning areas that lack of its study felt during your research. Even it is suggested to compare yours with other paper's conclusions and discuss more <p>Grammatical and literature of the paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Overall it is better to revise again your paper by a native English speaker 2) Please consider points which are mentioned in paper as comments 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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:	Mohammadsmaeil Kordjazi
Department, University & Country	Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Iran