

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_114833
Title of the Manuscript:	Dimensioning of the Work Environment and Prevalence of Pain in University Staff
Type of the Article	Original research article

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>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 important for the scientific community as it addresses the crucial issue of musculoskeletal pain among university staff, specifically focusing on the relationship between pain and the dimensions of the work environment. By highlighting the prevalence of pain and its connection to inadequate workstation conditions, the study sheds light on the significance of ergonomic considerations in improving the well-being and productivity of workers in educational institutions.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is appropriate as it accurately reflects the content and focus of the research.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article provides a clear overview of the research objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript seem appropriate for a research paper.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically sound in its methodology, results, and conclusions.</p> <p>The references provided span from 1980 to 2021, covering a broad range of relevant literature. However, some of the references are old, suggesting the need for updates to ensure the inclusion of more recent studies.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications. Although there are some minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that could be improved for clarity and readability:</p> <p>In the Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The objective of the research was to verify the relationship between musculoskeletal pain and the size of the work environment in the sitting posture of university agents." Consider rephrasing for clarity: "The research aimed to investigate the correlation between musculoskeletal pain and the dimensions of the work environment during sitting posture among university staff." Methodology: The evaluation of the prevalence of musculoskeletal pain using a recall record." Add a space after "Methodology:" for consistency. "The selected group is made up of university agents from UNICENTRO who agreed to participate in the research." Consider revising for clarity: "The study comprised university staff from UNICENTRO who voluntarily participated in the research." <p>In the Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "It can be understood that the absence of discomfort is directly related to the use of appropriate furniture, that is, compatible with the user's postural needs." Consider rephrasing for clarity: "The absence of discomfort is closely linked to the use of suitable furniture, tailored to the user's postural requirements." "workers from an ergonomics point of view, must be seen as integral beings, this fact contributes to work no longer being a heavy burden beyond what is necessary..." Consider breaking this into two sentences for better readability: "From an ergonomic perspective, workers must be viewed as holistic entities. This approach helps alleviate the burden of work beyond necessary tasks." <p>In the Material and Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "At the beginning of the research, the university had 277 university agents..." Consider revising 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>for clarity: "At the outset of the study, there were 277 university staff members..."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The university agent was asked to respond, at his work station..." Consider using gender-neutral language: "The university staff member was asked to respond at their workstation..." "The analysis was carried out using descriptive statistics with mean and standard deviation." Consider rephrasing: "Descriptive statistics, including mean and standard deviation, were employed for data analysis." <p><u>In the Results and Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The furniture used by both sexes of the participants showed that the measurements of the chair on the floor and the arm flexed on the chair present values higher than the estimates..." Consider rephrasing for clarity: "The furniture used by both male and female participants revealed that measurements of the chair's height from the floor and the distance from the armrest to the chair exceeded the estimated values..." "The information collected shows that ergonomically inadequate furniture, that is, outside of established standards, is the main factor in the prevalence of neck pain..." Consider rephrasing for clarity: "The collected data indicate that ergonomically inappropriate furniture, deviating from established standards, primarily contributes to the prevalence of neck pain..." <p><u>In the Conclusion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "In this study, some problematic elements were identified by the researchers and little noticed by users, such as the height of the chair." Consider rephrasing for clarity: "The study identified certain problematic aspects, such as chair height, overlooked by users but noted by researchers." 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Areas that require improvement include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity in reporting results: While the results are presented, some sections could benefit from clearer presentation, such as the comparison between furniture measurements and the prevalence of neck pain. Providing more concise and organized tables could enhance readability. Discussion depth: While the discussion provides relevant comparisons with previous studies, further discussion on the implications of the findings and potential solutions could strengthen the manuscript. Language and formatting: Some sections could be revised for clarity and consistency in language usage. Additionally, formatting improvements could enhance the overall presentation of the manuscript. 	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Iqra Asif</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Riphah International University, Pakistan</p>