



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_15164
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Health Hazards of the Goldsmiths in Tantibazar Area of Dhaka, Bangladesh
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It is rather qualitative investigation and it could serve as a starting point for a more quantitative approach to the problem. For instance, I suggest creation of a specific questionnaire for the goldsmiths involved where a specific numerical scale of possible answers could be used. The collected information could be used for statistical treatment as it is done in other studies using methods of behavioural statistics. I recommend to the authors to mention, at least, this opportunity in the introduction or in the conclusion.	Addressed in page 2 from line 70 to 73.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		