



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_49052
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Ergonomic Risks in Workers of the Furniture Industry
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Nil	
Minor REVISION comments	A graph for table 3 would be more appreciable .	To optimize the use of the data of the topic Biomechanics in table form (3) because it is part of the methodology and not of the results, thus it makes the evaluation parameters of the RULA method easy to understand.
Optional/General comments	DATA set is from the year 2016 Also the sample size is less (68) . However Kinesiological Analysis relatively new concept hence paper can be published For future a similar study with more number of samples can be tried in a similar setting.	

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>	The workers able to integrate the research were informed about the objectives, the methodology and the acceptance of participation. Ensuring your anonymity and image preservation. All agreed and signed the informed consent form and questionnaires were applied in the form of an individual interview. The project was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Federal University of Viçosa (CEP-UFV / CAAE: 55299216.9.0000.5153).