



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Cardiology Research</a>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJCR_62680  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | BLOOD OXYGEN SATURATION AND PROLONG FACE MASK USE IN HEALTHCARE WORKERS IN PORT HARCOURT NIGERIA, IN THE COVID 19 PANDEMIC ERA |
| Type of the Article      | Review 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/journal/10/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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>The authors must clarify on the following aspect of their result:</p> <p>*In the abstract, it is stated 'Age was significantly associated with differences in SPO<sub>2</sub> trend' and 'Type of facemask use had no significant effect on mean SPO<sub>2</sub> trend'.</p> <p>*However, in Table II, the P-value for type of facemask is given as 0.01 (&lt;0.05).</p> <p>*In p. 5, it is stated 'Age (P= 0.02) and Type of face mask (0.01) were significantly associated with differences in SPO<sub>2</sub> trend'.</p> <p>*In p. 7, it is reported that 'there was no significant difference in the Mean SPO<sub>2</sub> using the various mask'.</p> <p>*In the conclusion, it is mentioned 'the continuous use of face masks for 8 hours irrespective of age and type has no significant effect on the blood oxygen saturation'.</p> <p>The authors must clearly explain in the manuscript which of these statements is correct.</p> |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p>*The demographic information of the study participants, that is, gender, age, type of health worker, presence of underlying illness, type of face mask used, etc. is currently given in the results section. I recommend that the authors move this information to the methods section instead as it describes the basic/ essential details of the study.</p> <p>*In this context, the first four lines of the Result section must be moved to the Methods.</p> <p>*Further, the first six rows of Table I (Age, Gender, Job Description, Departments, Underlying medical illness and Mask type) must also be moved to the Methods section.</p>  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | <p>The paper is well-written. The introduction elucidates the background of the study and motivation for the work. The methods section provides a clear overview of the proposed methodology. The results are elaborate and comprise of adequate statistical analysis. The discussion is detailed and references are recent.</p>  |   |



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                              |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>N. Chelli Devi</b>        |
| Department, University & Country | <b>VIT University, India</b> |