



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_7903
Title of the Manuscript:	Occupational Health Hazards among Double Sided Printed Circuit Board Manufacturers
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) The English writing and/or language of the paper is not clear and specially the presentation of Abstract and Introduction. Thus the paper should be re-written in more comprehensive clear form. It is preferable that the whole manuscript be edited by a native English speaking personnel 2) The paper would be more scientific and solid if authors also in their statistical calculations reported the cross tabulation and Chi-Square to reflect better the statistical significance similarities and differences between the two studied groups and among the same group in regard to their measured or surveyed parameters. 3) A more comprehensive explanation should be provided for the higher values of Zn levels in blood of the Control group than the workers; and the high level of occupational asthma in the control group	1- I wrote the abstract to be in a clear form. (highlighted with yellow colour) 2- I wrote the statistical calculations in the tables and (highlighted with yellow colour). 3-Explanations in discussion are highlighted with yellow colour
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	If their recommendation is presented as a flow chart to enclose all necessity measures, policies and implementations, then their action plan would be well resolved and clarified. In the recommendation section if authors present a solution of the existing problem taking into consideration all stakeholders in a form of flow chart	Hierarchy of hazards control are written in conclusion and recommendation section (highlighted with yellow colour)
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is highly interesting and important for providing workers with safe atmosphere. Their findings and provided statistical calculations are scientifically sound Thus paper is accepted with minor changes and the above comments are addressed.	