

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_115481
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPUTERIZED ASSESSMENT OF READINESS (FOCOS/PRONTOS SYSTEM) AND ITS CAPACITY TO SCREEN FOR WORKER’S FATIGUE IN ITS MULTIFACTORIAL ASPECTS: Case-control and cross-sectional study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, This work enhances scientific understanding of fatigue management in the workplace and promotes proactive intervention strategies for safer and healthier working environments.</p> <p>The title can be made a little more comprehensive. A suggestion has been made here “Computerized assessment of readiness (FOCOS/PRONTOS SYSTEM) and its multifactor screening for worker’s fatigue: Case-control & cross-sectional study”</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive. But it would be appreciated if the abstract was made in a single paragraph without any subdivisions. As the paper already has relevant sub-divisions having the same sub-divisions in abstract makes it confusing and it feels inefficient. Hence abstract can be rewritten in a single paragraph.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections of the manuscript were found to be appropriate.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, the references were sufficient, relevant and are recent.</p>	<p>Dear,</p> <p>We appreciate the excellent reviews and comments.</p> <p>We adjusted the title following your suggestion, as well as recommendations from other editor/reviewer, to:</p> <p>“COMPUTERIZED ASSESSMENT OF READINESS(FOCOS/PRONTOS SYSTEM) AND ITS MULTIFACTOR SCREENING FOR WORKER’S FATIGUE AND PRODUCTIVITY: Case-control and cross-sectional study”</p> <p>We have edited the abstract removing the subdivisions and maintaining only two paragraphs. Please evaluate if any more adjustments are needed.</p>

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the quality of English is good and clear demonstration has been made by the author	
Optional/General comments	<p>The review provides valuable insights into the multifactorial nature of fatigue and the challenges in objectively measuring it. The introduction effectively sets the stage by highlighting the lack of consensus on measurement methods and the need for objective markers. It introduces the FOCOS/Prontos System as a potential solution to address these challenges.</p> <p>In methodology section, the study's approach is clearly outlined, including the application of the Chalder Fatigue Scale to a sizable sample of employees from a Brazilian mining company. The use of exclusion criteria ensures data reliability and validity. Statistical tests such as the Mann-Whitney U-test and Welch's t-test are appropriately employed to analyze readiness profiles between clinical and control groups.</p> <p>The results demonstrate significant differences in various readiness parameters between individuals with and without signs of fatigue. Importantly, the Prontos System is shown to have predictive value for fatigue-related risks and accident prevention measures. This underscores its potential in enhancing workplace safety and productivity.</p> <p>The conclusion effectively summarizes the study's findings and underscores the importance of daily and continuous fatigue assessment using the FOCOS/Prontos System. It emphasizes the system's multidimensional approach in enriching fatigue prediction and classification accuracy. Furthermore, it advocates for ongoing monitoring as a preventive strategy, highlighting the link between fatigue and accidents and the potential for proactive intervention.</p> <p>The author has given a demonstration that contributes to the understanding of fatigue management in the workplace and underscores the importance of implementing comprehensive assessment tools like the FOCOS/Prontos System for promoting a safer and healthier work environment.</p>	Thank you once again for your appreciation and profound understanding of our research article.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	