

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_129654
Title of the Manuscript:	Photoexposure and Risk Factors for the Development of Lesions in the Head and Neck of Professional Fishermen
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is a solid contribution to occupational health research but would benefit from more engaging language, balanced content distribution, and actionable recommendations. It's informative but could be more reader-friendly.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Photoexposure and Risk Factors for the Development of Lesions in the Head and Neck of Professional Fishermen," is informative but slightly long and technical. While it conveys the main idea, it could be more concise and engaging to attract a broader audience. Suggested : "Sunlight Exposure and Head-and-Neck Lesions in Fishermen: Risk Factors Unveiled"	

Review Form 3

<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>If we are considering the abstract of the article you shared earlier, here's my evaluation and suggestions:</p> <p>Evaluation:</p> <p>The abstract seems comprehensive, as it covers the study's purpose, findings, and implications. However, it could be enhanced for better clarity and impact by ensuring the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conciseness: Avoid lengthy sentences that might dilute the main points. 2. Specificity: Include key numerical data or statistics to strengthen the findings. 3. Practical Implications: Clearly state how the findings contribute to understanding or managing occupational or environmental health risks. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The article "Photoexposure and Risk Factors for the Development of Lesions in the Head and Neck of Professional Fishermen" provides valuable insights into a crucial occupational health issue. However, while the content is informative, some areas need refinement for better readability and impact. Here's an honest review:</p> <p>Suggested Areas for Improvement:</p> <p>Additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Repetitive Language: <p>Key terms like "photoexposure" and "lesions" are overused, making the text slightly monotonous.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Unbalanced Focus: <p>While the introduction is thorough, the discussion section lacks depth and does not fully connect findings to broader implications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Sentence Flow: <p>The writing occasionally feels technical and dense, which may alienate readers who are not specialists.</p> <p>Deletions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Redundant Information: If similar points are repeated (e.g., the risks mentioned in both introduction and results), streamline them. <p>Overall Impression:</p> <p>The article is a solid contribution to occupational health research but would benefit from more engaging language, balanced content distribution, and actionable recommendations. It's informative but could be more reader-friendly.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes they are apt</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Its good but few words as mentioned above are repetitive</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:	Shaik Shaheen
Department, University & Country	KNRUHS, India