

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_119054</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessing the occupational health hazards in paddy cultivation practices in the coastal region of Andhra Pradesh</b>
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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I recommend a revision of the abstract to enhance organization, conciseness, and reader-friendliness</li> <li>2. Abstract should include: study design, data collection period, sampling technique, data management and analysis, which software used for data analysis and ethical consideration</li> <li>3. I did not find any citation in introduction part.</li> <li>4. Why you are conducting this study/Any research gap? And clear objectives of this study should be mention in the introduction part.</li> <li>5. Gangopadhyay <i>et.al.</i>, 2010 also suggested that working in a squatting and awkward posture..... As you are making comparison with similar studies, this part must be discussed in the discussion part. Please follow Journal guidelines for manuscript writing.</li> <li>6. Methodology section is too short. Include the details about the tool (instrument or questionnaire) used for collecting the data/information from the farmers. Details such as pre-testing of the questionnaire, different sections of the questionnaire, types of questions and variables included should be given.</li> <li>7. The study variables are not clearly defined in the methodology section, which is necessary. The socio-demographic variables to be collected are also not mentioned in this section. It is incorrect to present data in the results section that have not been previously mentioned in the methodology.</li> <li>8. It was observed that data presented in the manuscript did not undergo statistical analysis. At present, the significance of data is not known and this is essential.</li> <li>9. How 120 participants were selected for the study, and were they representative of agricultural practices in the region?</li> <li>10. Please provide more information on the selection process of participants from the list of two districts namely East Godavari and West Godavari <i>provided by the authorities</i>. Were any biases introduced during participant recruitment?</li> <li>11. Please mention the sampling technique</li> <li>12. Though you have used standard questionnaire, is it copyright? Or free. Did you ask permission to use the tool? Were any pilot tests conducted to refine the questionnaire?</li> <li>13. Please mention clearly the inclusion and exclusion criteria in the methodology section</li> <li>14. What are the potential limitations or uncertainties in the study findings</li> <li>15. <b>Discussion part is missing</b> in the manuscript.</li> </ol> <p><b>Some clue for writing discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ It is recommended to start the first paragraph of the discussion with a brief reminder of the study's objective to regain the reader's attention.</li> <li>➤ Immediately afterward, the main findings of the study should be presented before</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>comparing them with the scientific literature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Limitation of your study</li> <li>➤ Bias in your study and how to avoid the bias</li> </ul> <p>16. What are the strengths of this study? The authors do not mention this aspect.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Leela Paudel
Department, University & Country	Nepalese Army Institute of Health Sciences, Nepal