

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_129794
Title of the Manuscript:	POSTURE AND ITS ASSOCIATED RISK FACTORS AMONG HOUSE OFFICERS
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers> Toffy09*turnitin

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript highlights the high prevalence of faulty postures among house officers and their association with long working hours, emphasizing their impact on musculoskeletal health. It underscores the importance of ergonomic interventions and workplace modifications to address these issues. The findings provide a foundation for future research and practical strategies to reduce posture-related risks in healthcare professionals.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The title "POSTURE AND ITS ASSOCIATED RISK FACTORS AMONG HOUSE OFFICERS" is somewhat suitable as it reflects the study's focus. However, it could be made more specific and engaging by emphasizing the type of postures (faulty postures) and the study's design or key findings.</p> <p>Suggested Alternative Titles: "Impact of Working Hours on Faulty Postures Among House Officers: A Cross-Sectional Analysis"</p>	Title revised

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is fairly comprehensive but could be improved with the following suggestions Context and Relevance - Include a brief sentence at the beginning to explain why studying faulty postures in house officers is significant (e.g., its impact on musculoskeletal health or occupational performance).</p> <p>Objective Clarity - Clearly state the objective, such as "to determine the prevalence of faulty postures and their association with working hours among house officers."</p> <p>Statistical Significance Threshold - Specify the statistical significance threshold (e.g., $p < 0.05$) for clarity</p> <p>The abstract of the article is fairly comprehensive but could be improved with the following suggestions:</p> <p>Additions: Context and Relevance Include a brief sentence at the beginning to explain why studying faulty postures in house officers is significant (e.g., its impact on musculoskeletal health or occupational performance). Mention the broader implications of the findings, such as the need for ergonomic interventions or workplace modifications.</p> <p>Objective Clarity Clearly state the objective, such as "to determine the prevalence of faulty postures and their association with working hours among house officers."</p> <p>Statistical Significance Threshold Specify the statistical significance threshold (e.g., $p < 0.05$) for clarity.</p> <p>Deletions/Refinements - Avoid overly detailed methodological descriptions, such as the use of "Open Epi software" or "general physical evaluation," unless directly relevant to the findings</p>	<p>Revised</p> <p>Effected revision</p> <p>Effected</p>
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in its general approach but contains areas that could be improved for clarity, consistency, and scientific rigor.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement <u>Statistical Details:</u> While the manuscript mentions the use of p-values, it does not explain the confidence intervals or provide a rationale for the chosen alpha level. Adding these details would strengthen the scientific rigor. The interpretation of p-values (e.g., $p = 0.05$) needs precision, particularly when discussing "statistical significance." For example, $p = 0.05$ is often borderline and should be interpreted with caution.</p> <p><u>Clarity in Methods:</u> Some methodological details, such as how the sampling technique was "systematic probability sampling," are unclear and need elaboration. A clear explanation of participant selection would enhance transparency. The exclusion criteria should be explicitly applied to ensure there is no selection bias.</p> <p><u>Results Interpretation:</u> While results are presented well, the discussion does not delve deeply into potential confounders (e.g., ergonomic practices, physical activity levels outside work) or alternative explanations for the findings. The manuscript lacks a discussion of whether the findings are generalizable beyond the specific study population.</p> <p><u>Language Issues:</u> Grammatical errors and inconsistent terminology (e.g., "lumber lordosis" instead of "lumbar lordosis") could affect scientific clarity.</p> <p><u>References:</u> Some references are incomplete or improperly formatted. Proper citation is critical for scientific accuracy.</p>	<p>Effected</p> <p>Revision made accordingly</p>

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>Sufficiency The references provided are extensive and cover a variety of topics related to faulty posture, musculoskeletal disorders, and ergonomic practices. They include foundational studies and notable works that contribute to the manuscript's focus. However:</p> <p>Some references may be outdated, such as those from the 1990s (e.g., Reference 3, 4, 14), which could reduce the manuscript's relevance to current scientific discussions.</p> <p>Recent advancements in ergonomic practices, posture-related interventions, and technology-based assessments (e.g., digital posture analysis tools) are not adequately represented. Recency A significant number of references are older than 10 years, with some dating back to the 1990s or early 2000s. This may not reflect the latest research trends or technological developments in the field.</p> <p>Only a few references are from the last five years, which limits the study's alignment with contemporary findings.</p>	
		Noted
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The language quality of the article is partially suitable for scholarly communication but requires improvement to meet academic standards. Here’s an evaluation</p> <p>Grammatical Errors: There are frequent grammatical mistakes that detract from the readability and professionalism of the text. Examples include ... "A cross-sectional study were conducted..." should be "A cross-sectional study was conducted." "Faulty posture like lordosis, kyphosis and scoliosis we observed through plumb line" should be "Faulty postures like lordosis, kyphosis, and scoliosis were observed using a plumb line." Inconsistent Tense Usage: The manuscript shifts between past and present tense inconsistently, which affects clarity. For instance: "The study was carried out after taken permission..." should be "The study was carried out after obtaining permission...." Awkward Phrasing: Many sentences are wordy or awkwardly phrased, which can confuse readers. For example: "Faulty postures are the main reason behind neck, back, and shoulder pain" could be revised to "Faulty postures are a significant cause of neck, back, and shoulder pain." Redundancy: Some information is repeated unnecessarily across sections, which affects conciseness. Scholarly Tone: Certain phrases are overly casual or imprecise for scholarly communication, such as "...we will observed faulty posture...."</p>	<p>Corrected as suggested</p> <p>Revised</p> <p>Done</p>
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	