



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_48312
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Assessment of Formaldehyde Concentrations in Public and Private Mortuaries in Rivers State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Short 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>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a very original and informative study. 2. Comments provided throughout the document. 3. Follow referencing style accepted by the journal if not as suggested in the document. 4. Be consistent using abbreviations. 5. Study area is not similar to study population. Separate them. Similarly, Study design and sample size are not synonymous. Separate them. 6. How many mortuaries from each stratum? 7. Rework data management subsection as suggested. 8. How did the author(s) ensure that the mortuary owners would not fall into hands of OSHA/NIOSHA reinforcing machineries??? The ethics. 9. What did the author(s) do to control the reported study limitation and its impact to the study findings, results, conclusions and recommendations made??? 10. Add brief narrative after each table/figure OR move results presented in Discussion to this section. 11. In the discussion, converse on key findings; that is, the interpretation of presentations in the tables and figures vs. existing literature. Do not present results at all. 12. There are mixed points in the conclusion and recommendations sections. Rearrange them to make it clear to the reader. 13. When making recommendation, target specific stakeholder(s) rather than being too general as indicated. Use your fieldwork experience. 14. References are rather too old! Any effort to improve on this??? 	
Minor REVISION comments	NONE.	
Optional/General comments	NONE.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Switbert Rwechungura Kamazima
Department, University & Country	Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Tanzania