

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_129357
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of headgear on physiological, physical response of male farm worker under heat stress condition
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

Review Form 3

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 is an important topic as is it is cultural and has practices in tradition.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title needs more clarity. I would suggest:	Noted
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.	In my view the abstract lacks important points: There needs to be a clear statement of the study objective Methods deployed including study design, sample size, analysis. There is too much information on the background which could be minimised.	Revised
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is on an important topic that needs attention. The author has worked in depth to present important findings. Some points may be noted: The introduction needs a rationale, an objective, there needs to be shown a gap in literature identified by the authors that led to this study. The abbreviations in tables need to be explained in footnotes. There are no ethical considerations mentioned.	Revised
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There is no in text citation throughout the introduction section. The tools used to collect the data need to be referenced.	Revised
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	This is fine.	ok
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

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