

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_129444
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of workload and pedalling rate on physiological response for male worker
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**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 addresses a critical and underexplored area of study by examining the Effect of workload and pedaling rate on physiological response for male worker. It provides valuable insights human muscle power in contributing energy required for performing many farm activities, offering a foundation on how to utilize muscle power and strategies. The study's findings are particularly relevant for male workers, enabling them to better understand the human muscles energy created by paddling and other occupational work to do various activities.	Revised
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable as it clearly reflects the scope and focus of the study. However, to make it more engaging and specific, an alternative title could be: <i>"Impact of pedaling speed and workload on a male worker's physiological response"</i> The title has no area of study. Include area of study; where the study was done.	Impact of pedaling speed and workload on a male worker's physiological response
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.	The abstract is generally comprehensive and provides a good overview. However, the objectives and methodology are missing in the abstract. I suggest emphasizing the inclusion of the objectives and summary how the research was conducted in the abstract, practical implications of the findings to be made more clearly, particularly how they can affect males. Additionally, analysis procedure is not clearly done. Add more results using numerical or data numbers from the analysis.	Revised
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound overall. The study examines the effect of workload and pedaling rate on physiological response for male worker, a relevant and important topic within forensic sciences and physiology. The methodology appears robust, although additional details regarding data collection, research instruments, and sampling procedures are needed to be strengthened and made clear to the scientific rigor. More information on the validity and reliability of the research tools would also enhance the overall credibility of the findings. While the study presents valuable insights, some minor clarifications and elaborations are needed in terms of the methods and analysis processes, particularly for participants. The references are old and out dated, need to be incorporated to more recent studies, current references and international perspectives would further solidify the manuscript's global relevance.	Revised
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references provided are insufficient. It is recommended to include more recent references, especially from 2020 and 2024, that address physiological responses on pedaling and workload-related topics. This will enhance the validity and relevance of the research.	Revised

**Review Form 3**

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are some grammatical and stylistic issues that need to be addressed. Some phrases could be reworded for clarity and a more neutral tone. Additionally, table and figure captions could be made more descriptive to better convey the meaning of the data. To ensure the manuscript meets the high standards of scholarly communication, I recommend that the article be reviewed by a professional language editor to address these issues and improve readability.</p>	<p>Revised</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript addresses an important and relevant topic— Effect of workload and pedaling rate on physiological response for male worker. The overall scientific content is strong, but some aspects of the methodology could be clarified and expanded upon, particularly regarding data collection, research tools, and focus group analysis. The study would benefit from a broader global perspective, with comparisons to similar issues in other countries. Additionally, the practical implications of the findings should be emphasized more prominently. The language quality is generally appropriate, but minor revisions in grammar, style, and clarity would improve the readability and professionalism of the manuscript. I recommend addressing the suggested revisions to improve the manuscript’s overall impact and ensure that it meets the scholarly communication standards.</p>	<p>Revised</p>

**PART 2:**

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