

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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>It very is important to the scientific community as it touches the aspect of mental or cognitive and social aspects of the people.</p> <p>The title is a little confusing and complex to a lay reader, needs to be simplified . I suggest the title as " Computerized Assessment of Fatigue and Readiness to worker's Performance and other multifactorial effects to productivity"</p> <p>The Abstract is comprehensive however, needs polishing and be presented in paragraphs not indicating the subheadings as presented. Also the keywords should be: Computerized Assessment, Fatigue, Readiness, and productivity.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references indicated are sufficient but few cited in the manuscript only about 6 references are cited in the manuscript.</p> <p>In writing a journal the author should present comprehensive information in a very precise way and should be coherently presented .</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, with some polishing and maintaining only two paragraphs. Please evaluate if any more adjustments are needed.</p> <p>We also greatly appreciate the keyword recommendations and agree.</p> <p>In regards to the references, we have registered (9) citations in the manuscript in Introduction and (8) in the Methodology section. Please let us know should we incorporate more in the text.</p>
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The English is simple and easily comprehensible by readers.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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