

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_83895
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF HEALTH AND SAFETY RISK AMONG WASTE SCAVENGERS IN ENUGU STATE, NIGERIA
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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Was the study carried out in Enugu City or in Enugu State? Please be clear (See Section 2.1)2. What is the distribution of the 9 active dumping sites per the three senatorial district? (See Section 2.3)3. How was the level of hazard exposure in Table 2 assessed?4. Is the income stated in Table 1 per week or per month or annual income?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Enugu State, Correction effected2. Three (3) dumping sites per senatorial district.3. Level of Hazard was assessed using the instrument of questionnaire.4. Income is per day. Corrections effected
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Grammatical errors could be corrected e.g., risks, activities, etc2. Typhoid vaccination could also be added to the list apart from Tetanus, Hepatitis B and COVID-19-vaccinations	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Errors corrected2. Scope will be expanded to accommodate this in subsequent research
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Inserting the map of Enugu State indicating the THREE senatorial districts will add value2. Apart from tables, pie charts and bar charts will add value3. Sample of questionnaire could be provided in an appendix4. Why only 2% of the respondents are female in Table 1? Could you have more females to ensure fair and equitable representation? Or is it that the females are just not there?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Map inserted2. Concerns noted for subsequent research3. Sample added4. Very few number of females into scavenging in the areas studied

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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