



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	Average paper, the contribution of researcher is very minimal. How the researcher able the check the disease that is not clear	Authors thank the reviewer for the valuable comment. However, we did not medically check the disease, but tried to bring the study populations common health hazards by FGDs with an aim to open up future research scope.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Try to highlight their Ethnographic and socio-economic condition	The authors appreciate the reviewers comments and suggestion. But, here in this study it is totally out of scope to include for this time. We must incorporate his suggestion in our future research
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Nothing special , just same mentioned above	