

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_85325
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge of Occupational Hazards and Safety Practice among Abattoir Workers of Katagum Local Government Area, Bauchi 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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The article submitted for review is totally current and of interest to the scientific community. It is an extremely complex activity and full of occupational risks, which, when not detected and controlled, can cause serious damage to the health of workers.</p> <p>I would like to make two points that I submit for consideration by the authors of the article:</p> <p>1. In the "Instrument description/data collection" section, the authors state verbatim: "A semi structured, interviewer administered Questionnaire was used for the study, and was adapted from the previous study.7 with some modifications to suit the objectives of this study" .</p> <p>Future readers of this article should know the content of the questionnaire that was applied and do not need to look for the article where it was applied previously. If comparing both questionnaires, what were the changes?</p> <p>2. In the "Conclusion" section, the authors of this article express textually: "The study revealed that majority of the respondents have good knowledge of occupational hazards, and high level of hygiene practice, but the use of personal protective equipment (PPE) were very low and most of the respondents stay at home when they are sick". This referee suggests that this conclusion be modified, since the non-use of PPE is contrary to adequate hygiene and safety practices. What is the status of collective protective equipment?</p>	<p>Thank you for your valid comments and observation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The areas that were adapted and modified from the questionnaire used are revised and highlighted in the main article; Ms_CJAST_853252. Regarding the conclusion, the study revealed that more than half of the respondents (63.8%) carryout meat inspection, but only about one third (35.5%) use Personal protective equipment (PPE) while performing their duty. This is in terms of use of apron/gown, hand gloves, face mask, safety boots. This is more of attitude, requiring behaviour change as highlighted in the revised paper. However, despite decreased in the use of PPE, majority of the respondents wash their hands before and after preparation of meat (96.1%) and after visiting the toilet (98.0%). About half of the butchers (49.3%) clean their work surfaces twice per day, (57.9%) clean their meat preparation instrument twice per day and more than half (64.5%) used water and detergent in cleaning their instruments. More studies are needed to determining the relationship between the high levels of personal hygiene practice despite the low level of the use of PPE among abattoir workers in this community. This is noted, and was revised appropriately in the revised article.
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	