

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	It’s a reasonable paper, that contributes to health research, however in order to published a lot of changes should be performed: 1. The methodology doesn’t comprise the time that the study was carried out. This section should answer the elements as follows: who, what, when, where, how, and why, in order to be a successful methods section. 2. The discussion is absent. This section includes the picture about the study object. The purpose of this section is to interpret and describe the significance of the study findings in light of what was already known about the subject being investigated, and to explain any new understanding or insights about the problem after have taken the findings into consideration. 3. The tables don’t contain sources. The source of the table should be indicated under the table, even if the author is the same person who wrote the paper. 4. The limitations of the study aren’t explicit. These limits should identify only those circumstances that had the greatest potential impact on the quality of the findings study and the ability to effectively answer the research questions and/or hypotheses.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tatiana Pereira das Neves Gamarra
Department, University & Country	Brazil