



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
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 (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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page 2, line 59- Objective should be mentioned more clearly</li> <li>2. „ lines 64- 68 Literature review in the introduction is meant for finding out the gaps of study where the present study objectives fit in.</li> <li>3. Page 2, lines 73-79 Individuals involved in cluster and units in a particular cluster is not important, how many individuals are involved to provide you the data is important and how you have selected them (those individuals out of so many)</li> <li>4. Page 3, line 89-93 Focus group discussion is not the proper way to look the health hazards objectively. Some objective health examinations would give more insights into the problem. However, how many individuals from each step of manufacturing was involved in the FGD</li> <li>5. Page 4, figure 2, It would be more interesting as how many individuals (male or female) are involved in each of the steps of manufacturing—there may have some overlapping areas also such where many individuals may be involved in many steps of manufacturing. Without mentioning number, percentage has no meaning.</li> <li>6. Page 5, line 149 what is meant by the word “Matrix”</li> <li>7. It would have been better to provide morbidity data with frequency of suffering for one or two months for a number of individuals involved in ornament manufacturing. However, you have not mentioned how you have collected those data presented in table 1. You have noted few diseases and others are ailments—present separately.</li> </ol> <p>Page 7, Discussion should be more precise, short and comparing with other published literatures. Your citations are mostly with text books not with original scientific work (articles of Journals). Modify the</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<b>discussion. Try to avoid subheadings. Highlight findings at the beginning</b>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Check spelling</li> <li>2. Page 5, line 129 What do you mean by SPMs</li> <li>3. Line 131 H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> mention clearly Sulphuric Acid</li> <li>4. Line 132 HNO<sub>3</sub> mention clearly Nitric Acid</li> </ol>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page 3, Map may be deleted</li> <li>2. Page 4, Figure 2 may be deleted better to provide each step with individuals involved in a tabular form</li> <li>3. Figure 3, 4, 5 may be deleted unless numbers are mentioned somewhere in the table or text</li> </ol>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anonymous</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>