



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	Study seems to be cross-sectional and does not show any significant relationship and correlation. I think there is a need for a control group to show the exact meaning of given results. I couldn't find enough information about the study population. I would like to know; how many workers does such area have and how many of them were reached in this study? I would like to know the exact rate of reached population.	The authors appreciate the reviewer's comments and suggestion. But, here in this study it is totally out of scope to include significant relationship and correlation, and to show a control group for this time. We must incorporate his suggestion in our future research. Study population has been mentioned at line 80 in page 3. The number of FGD participant has been provided in section 2.2 in page 4
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		