



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_46662
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF FALLS AND ASSOCIATED FACTORS AMONG CONSTRUCTION WORKERS IN PORT HARCOURT, NIGERIA
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The topic is of interest to safety professionals as well as academic. The substantial changes need to be made in order for the paper to be considered for publication. Below are some comments to help Authors improve their paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The article is not prepared according to the journal's guidelines. Incorrect reference style. Please check the general guideline for authors and use paper template.</li> <li>2. Incorrect match formula (page 3; Sample size). According to the guidelines: "All equations referred to in the text should be numbered serially at the right-hand side in parentheses. Meaning of all symbols should be given immediately after the equation at first use". Please add meaning of all symbols.</li> <li>3. According to the Reviewer in order to better understand the conducted research the Authors should add questionnaire to the article. "Study Instruments" describes the questionnaire very generally. From the article the Reader know only that: "The questionnaire explored socio-demographics, occupational history, prevalence and pattern of falls among the respondents and awareness of safety" – according to the Reviewer this information is not enough to understand what exactly the Authors research.</li> <li>4. "Results" – in the text the Authors write that "A total of 349 questionnaires were administered over a period of sixteen (19) days". What was the period of research? Sixteen or 19 days?</li> <li>5. "Report of the walk-through survey" - The observations in this section are only qualitative. There is no quantification. The terms like "majority of", "some of the construction sites", "some sites", "most of the construction site", "most of the stairs" do not allow to determine the general conclusions. The Reviewer agree that the information in this section presents the reality of construction sites but the form of their presentation/description should change.</li> <li>6. "Discussion" – The discussion of the obtained results is done very accurate and honest but Authors should do a better job in the description of the study implication to construction safety in both research and practice.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	not applicable	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	not applicable	



**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Mariusz Szóstak</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Wroclaw University of Science and Technology, Poland</i></b>