

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_122039
Title of the Manuscript:	Postural Assessment and Risk Evaluation of Workers in Five Selected Textile Industries in Lagos
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The study address a significant issue in occupational health, specifically focusing on work related MSK disorder (WRMSD)in Textile workers. They have used standardized tools such as Nordic questionnaire & REBA (Rapid entire body assessment) provides a validated method for assessing both objective & subjective data.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The article is comprehensive in identifying and analyzing the factors contributing to Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders (WRMSDs) among Lagos textile workers, using detailed demographic, ergonomic, and environmental data. However, it could be more complete by including recommendations for interventions, a discussion on the long-term effects of WRMSDs, and comparisons with other industries or regions.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript's structure seems appropriate if it includes sections like Introduction, Methodology, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. This organization effectively presents the study's objectives, findings, and implications.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound because it uses established methodologies, such as the Nordic questionnaires and Rapid Entire Body Assessment (REBA), which are widely recognized for evaluating musculoskeletal disorders and ergonomic risks. The study's systematic approach to data collection and analysis, including the use of quantitative metrics to assess worker health and workplace conditions, ensures accuracy and reliability. Additionally, the inclusion of both physical and environmental factors provides a comprehensive view of the challenges faced by workers, strengthening the overall validity of the findings.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The sufficiency and recency of references aren't clear from the excerpt. The manuscript should include recent and relevant sources, especially studies on WRMSDs, REBA methodology, and ergonomic interventions. If these areas aren't well-covered, adding recent studies and reviews would strengthen the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Based on the provided excerpt, the language of the article seems appropriate for scholarly communication. It is clear, formal, and precise, effectively conveying the study's findings and methodologies. This style is suitable for an academic audience, ensuring that the information is communicated professionally and accurately.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Tilak Francis TG
Department, University & Country	Vels University, India