



Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_55323
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of sawmill workers towards occupational health and safety at Linden/Soesdyke Highway
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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. Add country of study in the tile as suggested. 2. Address K2; K3 and the rest of the comments made. 3. Briefly present on the Occupational Safety and Health Act, 1997, the GFC Code of Practice for Forestry Operations for State Forest Commission Holders (2013) and the Code of Practice for Wood Processing Facilities. In relation to this study for clarity. 4. Why did the two mills refuse granting study permit? 5. Report on tests conducted and applicable to this manuscript/presentation. 6. What do categories mean: adequate knowledge, average and poor for knowledge, attitudes and practices? 7. Follow accepted way of labeling Tables and Figures. 8. In the discussion present what other studies referred to reported. 9. Do not introduce new findings in the discussion. See comments (K33; 34). This should be checked/corrected. 10. Conclusions and recommendations made should result-based/grounded. 11. An additional eye from a statistician recommended. 12. References are outdated!!! Check for current ones on the topic/problem addressed. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manuscript editing strongly recommended. 	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It seems this study had no research clearance! If author(s) had one, they should state so OR Was research clearance granted? By which body/institution? 	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Switbert Rwechungura Kamazima
Department, University & Country	Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Tanzania