



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 <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	The results section of the abstract needs to be revised to be more informative and to support the conclusion. The percent of several conditions are given for exposed workers but no information is provided about the unexposed workers so that the reader can determine if they are higher in exposed workers. Also the abstract states that levels of the contaminants were statistically significantly higher in exposed workers. It would be helpful to provide levels or information on the difference. Grammar, punctuation, and capitalization needs to be checked as there were several errors throughout which are distracting.	I have revised the results in the abstract; they were highlighted with yellow colour.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The following sentence in the results needs to be moved to the discussion section: "This study provides evidence that exposure to fumes and dust encountered during the process of printed circuit board manufacture, increases the risk of respiratory complaints."	I removed this sentence from the results and put it in the discussion. They were highlighted with yellow colour.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Some of the phrasing seems awkward, e.g. , in the abstract "...investigations as Lead, Cadmium, serum copper and zinc levels were measured." Suggest "...and levels of lead, cadmium, copper and zinc were measured." Although the article evaluates an important topic and offers results and conclusions worth considering, the style of the writing is too distracting and the many grammatical errors make this manuscript not suitable for publication in its current form.	I changed this sentence.