

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AJMPCP_87520
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of musculoskeletal symptoms among computer workers and questionnaire validation: A cross-sectional study from Lahore, Pakistan.
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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Title In the title should be link to purpose of the study, such as prevalence of MSDs, risk factor and should give specific name of the questionnaire "Maastricht Upper Extremity Questionnaire".</p> <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Please recheck the number of sample size in abstract, methodology and result part.- In result parts, please showed $p < 0.01$ instead $p = 0.00$ because it always has the number behind zero. <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Please kindly add more detail about prevalence of MSDs among computer workers by literature review, how big of this problem in world wild.- Please recheck in objective of the study and revise to the same objective in an abstract and introduction part. <p>Materials & methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Please clearly identified the task of computer worker because this career has many types of work.- Please add the references on questionnaires which you applied on the study.- Your method accesses the last 12 months of WMSDs but in the result you presented in last 7 days, please clearly identify on this point. Because it represents that you focus on long term exposure or short-term exposure.- It will great if you show the conceptual framework for identify all variables. Reader can easier understand your point.- Please add more detail about data collection when you tested reliability section. <p>Result</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- When you presented the table, it will great if you use the word instead the sentence in your questionnaire.- Please write the result follow your research objective.- It's better if you give the result in body part that they pained.- In table 4, should present the number of participants in each factor that you compared.- In table 6, should present the mean and SD in body posture section.- It's not clear in psychosocial factor or stress of worker, please identified more details. Which parts of your result represented on this point? <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Please give more previous study for support your result, step by step through your objective.- Please give the information in associated factors in specially. How many factors that you got? How it effects on their health?	<p>Title Thank you. I made changes accordingly</p> <p>Abstract Thank you. I made changes accordingly</p> <p>Introduction Thank you. I made changes accordingly</p> <p>Materials & methods Thank you. I made changes accordingly.</p> <p>Result Thank you. I made changes accordingly. -Table 4 shows factors loading of different type of questions, so I didn't change these questions to smaller sentences. Rest of the questions were to be concise in all the tables. -In this study, muscular skeletal pain in any part of body was outcome variable that was compared with no muscular skeletal pain with different work-related factors. Discuss the affected parts of body are beyond the scope of this paper. - Thank you. I made changes accordingly. -In table 6, body posture section is as categorical response , that is why presented as Percentage of participants responded to any of the five available answers. Discussion: Thank you. I made changes accordingly</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- In methodology, please give the detail of statistical analysis. And how you analyse the data.- Please recheck the consistency in every parts.	Thank you. I made changes accordingly Yes, I checked value of Consistency and Correlation.
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- It's better if you test the reliability before you used.- Be consider that the propriated is at least 0.7. <p>If yes, please explain how there are competing interest issue and which part is related?</p>	

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)	Thank you. I made changes accordingly