
[EASR] Editor Decision

1 message

Engineering and Applied Science Research via Thai Journals Online (ThaiJO)

Wed, Sep 6, 2023 at 4:44

<admin@tci-thaijo.org>

PM

Reply-To: Engineering and Applied Science Research <kku.enjournal@gmail.com>

To: Farid Ma'ruf <farid.maruf@ie.uad.ac.id>, Agung Kristanto <agung.kristanto@ie.uad.ac.id>, Choirul Bariyah <choirul.bariyah@ie.uad.ac.id>, Tri Budiyanto <tri.budiyanto@ie.uad.ac.id>, Amirul Hazji Hasibuan <gamaasrik22@gmail.com>, Gamma Adi Pangestu <agung.kristanto@kkumail.com>, Okka Adiyanto <okka.adiyanto@ie.uad.ac.id>

Dear authors,

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Engineering and Applied Science Research, "Correlation Analysis Between Individual Characteristic Factors of Fisherman on The Perceived Pain in Grasping Activities".

Our decision is: Major Revisions Required

Your revision is due by **September 20, 2023**.

If your paper is revised, please kindly send 1. Full revised manuscript with highlight 2. Blind revised manuscript with highlight and 3. Paper revising form.

**** NOTE **** The revision of the article, please highlight the text has changed (Use different colors for each reviewer).

Best Regards,
Editorial Team
Engineering and Applied Science Research
Faculty of Engineering,
Khon Kaen University, 40002 Thailand
kku.enjournal@gmail.com

Reviewer 1:

Public comments for the authors

Comment

1. Abstract should be written more concisely and shorter. The abstract does not explicitly discuss the generalization of the finding beyond the specific study population. It does not mention any limitations of the study, such as size or potential confounding factors.
2. The introduction does not provide sufficient background information to contextualize the study.
3. The result does not show the program screen to calculate the values. There is not questionnaire.
4. In the discussion, the data should be provided from 50 testers and how they relate to the design.
5. From the designed assistive design, it has been tested to determine if it can effectively reduce injuries. The results of the experiments should be presented.
6. The conclusion could improve by providing a clearer and more specific summary of the significant correlations, analyzing the reasons behind the lack of correlation for internal individual characteristic factors, addressing the generalizability of the findings, and suggesting potential future directions for research.
7. The references cited in the article should not exceed years.

Reviewer 2:

Public comments for the authors

Understanding the relationship between individual characteristics and perceived pain in grasping activities

can inform the development of targeted interventions to minimize the pain experienced by fishermen, thereby promoting their well-being and productivity.

My comments on the submitted manuscript are reported below.

1. Title: The title of the manuscript needs to be revised to: Correlation between characteristics of fishermen and the perceived pain in grasping activities;
2. Abstract: As mentioned in the methodology section of the abstract, the authors used the Chi-square test to determine if there was a relationship between fishermen's characteristics and MSDs caused by grasping activity in the hands. Is that possible? Both the explanatory and dependent variables were continuous variables as reported in the manuscript. Therefore, how can chi-square and Fisher's exact test be used to determine the relationship between two continuous variables? The chi-square statistic is used to determine whether there is a relationship between two categorical variables, but not between two continuous variables. In order to determine the relationship between two continuous variables, the correlation coefficient (Pearson's r) is the appropriate statistical test. Therefore, if the authors used the correlation coefficient (Pearson's r) to determine whether there is a significant correlation between the characteristics of fishermen and the perceived pain in grasping activities, then they must revise their manuscript methodology, particularly the statistical analysis part, and change the chi-square and Fisher's exact test into Pearson's correlation coefficient.
3. Abstract: results section of the abstract, considering my above number 2 comments, the authors should revise the statement "Chi-Square and Fisher's analysis revealed a significant correlation between the duration of a day's labor and discomfort in the thumbs and wrists of fishermen."
4. Introduction: the authors state on page 3, paragraph 2, lines number 50 - 55 that "Based on data from the Occupational Health and Safety Center of Yogyakarta Province, marine fisheries activities... weighing fish, unloading caught fish, pushing boats, and more", but the source document is/are not referenced. Hence, the authors need to cite the source document or article.
5. Introduction: On page 3, paragraph 3, lines number 60 – 61, the statement "Fishermen on the south coast of Gunungkidul operated outboard motorboats with 315 boats in 2020" should be cited.
6. Materials and methods: The authors reported that they used SNQ and NRS questionnaires to collect data on musculoskeletal disorders. However, the authors did not mention how they would measure the device scale and interval in relation to pain extent, nor did they explain how they would interpret the results. It is therefore necessary for the authors to consider these comments and incorporate them into the materials and methods section of the manuscript.
7. Materials and methods: The statistical analysis part of the methodology is confusing because chi-square and Fisher's exact tests were used to determine the relationship between two continuous variables (see my comments on number 2). The authors should first specify which explanatory or independent variables are continuous and categorical before discussing statistical analysis. Accordingly, the authors should create a subtitle about the study variables, and under study variables, both dependent and independent variables should be clearly defined, including their types, whether categorical or continuous. Regarding the chi-square and Fisher's exact tests, I have already commented under abstract number 2 and the authors have to correct their manuscript accordingly, unless they need to provide a justification of why they used both chi-square and Fisher's exact tests to determine the relationship between two continuous variables. The statistical analysis of this study is generally inappropriate, and the authors should revise it in accordance with the objectives of the study.
8. Materials and methods: On page 5, lines number 116 – 118, under statistical analysis, the authors reported that "Variables, including age, BMI, duration of work per day, work experience, and level of pain felt in the hands, are presented in frequency and percentage." Were both the frequency and percentage presented? Because I did not see them under the results section and the authors need to report accordingly, unless the statement should be omitted from the manuscript.
9. Results: I suggest revising the results section of 3.3, including Table 2, based on my comments on numbers 2 and 7.
10. Upon revision of the results, comments will be provided on the discussion and conclusion of the study.



L-PAPER REVISING FORM (First review).doc
45K

[EASR] Editor Decision

1 message

Engineering and Applied Science Research via Thai Journals Online (ThaiJO)

Thu, Dec 7, 2023 at 10:36

<admin@tci-thaijo.org>

AM

Reply-To: Engineering and Applied Science Research <kku.enjournal@gmail.com>

To: Farid Ma'ruf <farid.maruf@ie.uad.ac.id>, Agung Kristanto <agung.kristanto@ie.uad.ac.id>, Choirul Bariyah <choirul.bariyah@ie.uad.ac.id>, Tri Budiyanto <tri.budiyanto@ie.uad.ac.id>, Amirul Hazji Hasibuan <gamaasrik22@gmail.com>, Gamma Adi Pangestu <agung.kristanto@kkumail.com>, Okka Adiyanto <okka.adiyanto@ie.uad.ac.id>

Dear authors,

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Engineering and Applied Science Research, "Correlation Analysis Between Individual Characteristic Factors of Fisherman on The Perceived Pain in Grasping Activities".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Your revision is due by **December 21, 2023**.

If your paper is revised, please kindly send 1. Full revised manuscript with highlight 2. Blind revised manuscript with highlight and 3. Paper revising form.

**** NOTE **** The revision of the article, please highlight the text has changed.

Best Regards,
Editorial Team
Engineering and Applied Science Research
Faculty of Engineering,
Khon Kaen University, 40002 Thailand
kku.enjournal@gmail.com

Comment from the editor

Public comments for the authors

1. Motivation of the proposed scheme is not clear. Also, contributions should be better described.
2. Clear aims, main contributions, and novelty are missing in the abstract. Now the abstract is extensive, but not concise.
3. In the introduction section the following tasks should be fulfilled: the introduction should give an overview of the field significance, and should consider the following main questions: What are the gaps in literature? What are the main aims of this article?" Also, contributions should be better described.
4. In literature review, authors should review more literatures and the article should be adding the summary of research background and literature review in the table for focusing a research topic.
5. The conclusion needs to better tie the results of this research back the literature — how it compares with and how it extends current knowledge. It also needs to discuss limitations of the study.
6. Your manuscript should be reviewed by a native speaker to ensure that the English is improved to the highest possible level.



B-PAPER REVISING FORM (Second review).doc

40K