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	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. I would like to make two points that I submit for consideration by the authors of the article: 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" . 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? 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?	
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:	**Eduardo Concepción Batiz**
Department, University & Country	**Brazil**