



## INDO AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH



### SPIROMETRIC EVALUATION OF LUNG FUNCTION OF COAL WORKERS, WORKING AT MACH (BOLAN DISTRICT)

Ghulam Sarwar<sup>1</sup>, Muhammad Younis<sup>1</sup>, Shafi Muhammad<sup>2</sup>, Tanzeel Ahmed Randhawa<sup>3\*</sup>, Muhammad Siddique<sup>1</sup>, Jahanzaib<sup>4</sup>, Bashir Ahmed<sup>1</sup>, Munir Ahmed<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Pharmacology, Faculty of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, University of Balochistan, Quetta, Pakistan.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Pharmacognosy, Faculty of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, University of Balochistan, Quetta, Pakistan.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Pharmacy Practice, Faculty of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, University of Balochistan, Quetta, Pakistan.

<sup>4</sup>Department of Physiology, Bolan Medical Collage Quetta, Pakistan.

#### ARTICLE INFO

##### Article history

Received 12/05/2017

Available online  
31/05/2017

##### Keywords

Coal Workers,  
Lung Function,  
Spirometry  
Mach,  
Balochistan,  
Pakistan.

#### ABSTRACT

To appraise the coalmines tidy impact on lung function among coal workers and non-coal workers. This was case-control study. The 140 male coalmines workers and non-coalmines workers, 20-50 years, over one year of working ability were chosen. Study was completed in the Mach, Bolan area, Baluchistan, Pakistan. The Spirometer and self-outlined overview per forma were utilized. The meeting was led and certainties was reported in the review shape and Spirometric tests was accomplished for coalmines specialists and non-coalmines laborers independently. The enlightening factual estimations and ( $P < 0.05$ ) were identified for coal workers and non-coal workers through SPSS 22. The mean estimation of FVC in coal workers was (56.81%) and in non-coal workers was (64.84%). The FEV1 in the coal workers was (62.60%) and in non-coal workers was (73.09%). The PEFR was (71.89%) in coal workers yet in non-coal workers was (84.61%). The FEV1/FVC ratio was (112.95%) in coal workers and in non-coal workers was (113.87%). The FEF25-75% in coal workers was (92.34%) and in non-coal workers was (97.57%). Inquire about discovered that no huge change found among coal workers and non-coal workers. The mean estimation of PEFR, FVC and FEV1 were unmistakably diminished in coal workers than non-coal workers which must be seen and on the off chance that it diminished to half or lesser would do well to be hospitalized in time.

#### Corresponding author

##### Tanzeel Ahmed Randhawa

M.Phil. Student,  
Department of Pharmacy Practice,  
Faculty of Pharmacy and Health Sciences,  
University of Balochistan, Quetta, Pakistan.  
tanzeel\_ahmed27@yahoo.com  
Phone# +923148126949/+923360832819

Please cite this article in press as **Tanzeel Ahmed Randhawa et al. Spirometric Evaluation of Lung Function of Coal Workers Working at Mach, Bolan District. Indo American Journal of Pharmaceutical Research.2017:7(05).**

Copy right © 2017 This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Indo American journal of Pharmaceutical Research, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## INTRODUCTION

Coal has been most commonly and extensively used mineral for eras but at the similar times respirations sicknesses and disabilities associated to the job-related contact to coal soil has been the greatest frequently documented in both settled and developing nations [1, 2]. Coal is still an important energy source and extracted in several republics as well as Pakistan [1]. Pakistan has become wide coal deposits (184 Billion Tones) in entirety in four provinces, as well as NWFP [1]. Hangu and Cherat are the key region in NWFP (North West Frontier Province), famous for coal mining and the projected held in reserve only in Cherat region is of 2 million tones and kinds of the firewood is bituminous [1]. Coal miners at danger increasing many disease associated to their work-related dust contact, dependent upon the kind and dust nature, inhaled particles size, age at first contact, entire length of contact and occupation nature [1, 3, 4].

Concealed coal taking out may result in the growth of coal worker's pneumoconiosis (CWP), chronic bronchitis, silicosis, and either one individually or in variable mixtures [5]. Pulmonary function defects in coal mine workers may happen in association by each of these pulmonary situations however as in non-coal mines workers, can extant in the non-appearance of all of them [5]. As smoking of cigarette may also result in defects in pulmonary function chronic bronchitis or together, it is often problematic and occasionally difficult to describe the comparative assistances of the coal mine dust inhalation and cigarette smoke to the incidence of useful irregularities in a smoking coal mines workers [5]. Also varied soil pneumoconiosis, coal mining has been exposed to a danger issue for (COPD) [6-11].

The pneumoconiosis is quiet a main reason of debility universal although reduction occurrence in western nations [12] in addition in Pakistan no exception however the disease load is unidentified [1]. Utah, by its massive concealed coal assets can expect a growing future populace of coal mines workers, ground surveys through the (USPHS) United States Public Health Service have established an inferior occurrence of CWP among far western instead of mid-western and eastern soft coal mines workers [13]. The analyses of distant western coal comprised one in Colorado and two in Utah [13]. The minor occurrence of CWP in the West due to inferior alveolar admission of dust as of lesser levels of mine dust in western coalmines in the past, but it might too be due at smallest in part, to the fresh demonstration that in contrast to "Pennsylvania" fire wood, Utah fire wood cracks into bigger particles and has fewer cellular poisonousness [14].

In analyze, American event inquires about from the (NSCWP) "National Study of Coal Workers Pneumoconiosis" have not intricate prompt social event of tidy contact estimations [3]. As an option years of covered coal mine occupation and business related data have been utilized as substitution dealings of clean contacts [15-18]. For the benefit of case, the pattern just before higher clean levels as one goes from evident to transport to haulage to face work was utilized through Kibelstisand partners [15], who built up a diminishing in FEV between non-smoking face representatives paralleled by non-smoking surface workers [18].

This review was led by the reason for evaluating the relationship between inward breath coals cleans, this review takings new information on tidy contact and relates it to contact response copies for FVC, FEV1, PEFr, FEV/FVC and FEF25-75.

## METHODOLOGY:

### Design of Study:

This was case-control study.

### Study Location:

The research was conducted in the Mach, district of Bolan, Balochistan, Pakistan.

### Introduction to District Bolan:

Locale Bolan is in the midpoint of territory of Balochistan, Pakistan. The Bolan pass 85 km long beginnings from (Kolpur), the most extreme place in district by a tallness of 2,200 meters Overhead Ocean neck and neck. The DHQ (District Head Quarter), Dhadar, Distirct Bolan is found close the arrangement of waterway of Bolan. The District is secured of plain and precipitous zones. Mach Tehsil is basically precipitous while the leftover Tehsils i.e. Sanni, Dhadar, Khattan Blanarai and Bhag, are secured of plain zones. People for a considerable length of time the boss Bolan tribe was Kurd and the Bolan boss and the Sardar Dinnar Khan Kurd was most extreme detectable Bolan identity. The Bolan locale individuals in {2005} was unsurprising to be overhead [45, 0000]. The Muslims found over 99 percent of the tenants. There is an immaterial Hindu people group in sub-division of Bhag. Region is having the coal generation. Therefore a few cases are expressed of coal chances which extra passing's lead and inability/wounds likewise a few representatives include in coal laborers. A proper guarded moves fundamental to make and thought to minimize the assets of such conditions.

### Sample Selection Criteria:

The male coal laborers and non-coal laborers age assemble between 20-50 years, over one year of work experience were chosen in this review.

### Sample Size:

One hundred and forty male members were similarly separated in two gatherings: coal specialists and non-coal.

### Instruments Used for Data Collection:

The self-designed survey and Spirometer were utilized. The prior agreement was possessed from the all respondents of coal workers and non-coal workers.

### Study Procedure:

The aggregate 140 review members were designated. The members were distanced into two sets on the bases of 1:1. The meeting was led on both gatherings, coal specialists and non-coal laborers of the Mach, locale Bolan, Balochistan, Pakistan and truths archived in the study shape and Spirometry was accomplished for coal laborers and non-coal specialists separately, FVC (Forced Vital Capacity), FEV1 (Forced Expiratory Volume in One Second), PEFR (Peak Expiratory Flow Rate), FEV1/FVC ratio and FEF25-75% (Forced Mid Expiratory Flow), found and investigated.

### Statistical Analysis:

The rate, recurrence, mean and standard deviation were recognized for coal laborers and non-coal specialists. Friedman's two-way examination trial was reasonable and ( $P < 0.05$ ) was identified by means of SPSS 22.

### Ethical Consideration:

Research was acknowledged through the Research and Ethics Committee, Faculty of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, University of Baluchistan, Pakistan. Earlier authorization form was full from all the review respondents, coal laborers and non-coal specialists of Mach, Bolan area of Balochistan, Pakistan.

### RESULT:

Coal Workers; add up to seventy guys coal specialist were designated out of which 20-29 years old gathering were 31 (44.28%), 30-39 years age gathering were 26 ( 37.14%), between 40-49 years old gathering were 06 (8.57%) and age assemble 50 &> years were 07 (10.0%) as appeared in table 2. The cigarette smokers were 21 (30.0%) and non-cigarette smokers were 49 (70.0%). The mean $\pm$ sd of age was 32.59 $\pm$ 12.06, mean $\pm$ std of height (m) was 167.59 $\pm$ 8.150, weight (kg) was 71.40 $\pm$ 18.09, BMI (Body Mass Index) was 25.26 $\pm$ 5.02, beat rate was 88.03 $\pm$ 18.26, mean $\pm$ std of systolic blood pressure was 129.34 $\pm$ 18.79 and diastolic blood pressure was 87.76 $\pm$ 20.75 as in table no 1.

Non-coal workers; add up to seventy guys non-coal laborers were chosen out of which age bunch between 20-29 years were 47 (67.14%), age gather between 30-39 years were 18 ( 25.71%) , age aggregate between 40-49 years were 04 (5.71%) and age assemble 50 &> years were 01 (1.42%) as appeared in table 2. The cigarette smokers were 21(30.0%) and non-cigarette smokers were 49 (70.0%). The mean $\pm$ sd of age was 32.59 $\pm$ 12.06, mean $\pm$ std of stature (m) was 167.59 $\pm$ 8.150, weight (kg) was 71.40 $\pm$ 18.09, BMI was 25.26 $\pm$ 5.02, beat rate was 88.03 $\pm$ 18.26, mean $\pm$ std of systolic pulse was 129.34 $\pm$ 18.79 and diastolic circulatory strain was 87.76 $\pm$ 20.75 and as appeared in table no 1.

**Table No.1: Demographic Characteristics.**

Description	Smokers (N)	Non-Smokers (N)	Age	Height (m)	Weight (kg)	BMI	Pulse Rate	Systolic (B.P)	Di Systolic (BP)
Coal Workers									
N	21	49	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Mean	N/A	N/A	32.59	167.59	71.40	25.26	88.03	129.34	87.76
Std. Deviation	N/A	N/A	12.063	8.150	18.091	5.020	18.261	18.797	20.755
Non-coal Workers									
N	2	68	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Mean	N/A	N/A	26.40	172.51	68.31	10.69	92.87	123.57	82.60
Std. Deviation	N/A	N/A	7.060	6.399	10.31	45.312	5.138	10.185	9.657

Spirometry relationship among coal laborers and non-coal specialists as in table no.02; the mean estimation of FVC in coal specialists age amass between 20-29 years was 57.03%, while the non-coal laborers demonstrates FVC mean an incentive around 20-29 years was 62.02%, the FVC mean an incentive in laborers age assemble between 30-39 years was 58.62%, though the non-coal laborers indicates FVC mean an incentive around 30-39 years was 69.94%, the FVC mean an incentive in coal laborers age gather between 40-49 years was 53.50%, while the non-coal specialists indicates FVC mean an incentive around 40-49 years was 74.50% and the FVC mean an incentive in coal laborers age aggregate between 50 &> years was 52.00%, while the non-coal specialists indicates FVC mean an incentive around 50 &> years was 67.00%.

The FEV1 mean an incentive in coal laborers age aggregate between 20-29 years was 61.77%, while the non-coal specialists indicates FEV1 mean an incentive around 20-29 years was 71.02%, the FEV1 mean an incentive in coal laborers age bunch between 30-39 years was 64.15%, though the non-coal specialists demonstrates FEV1 mean an incentive between 30-39 years was 75.89%, the FEV1 mean an incentive in coal specialists age assemble between 40-49 years was 64.50%, though the non-coal specialists demonstrates FEV1 mean an incentive around 40-49 years was 82.00% and the FEV1 mean an incentive in coal laborers age amass

between 50 &> years was 58.86%, while the non-coal laborers demonstrates FEV1 mean an incentive around 50 &> was 84.00% as existing in table 2.

The PEFR mean an incentive in coal laborers age assemble between 20-29 years was 79.94%, while the non-coal specialists indicates PEFR mean an incentive between 20-29 years was 83.38%, the PEFR mean an incentive in coal specialists age gather between 30-39 years was 75.62%, though the non-coal specialists demonstrates PEFR mean an incentive between 30-39 years was 87.61%, the PEFR mean an incentive in coal specialists age amass between 40-49 years was 64.17%, though the non-coal laborers indicates PEFR mean an incentive between 40-49 years was 85.75% and the PEFR mean an incentive in coal specialists age bunch between 50 &> years was 64.43%, while the non-coal laborers demonstrates PEFR mean an incentive between 50 &> years was 84.00% as existing in table 2.

The FEV1/FVC ratio mean an incentive in coal specialists age assemble between 20-29 years was 110.28%, while the non-coal laborers indicates FEV1/FVC ratio mean an incentive between 20-29 years was 114.72%, the FEV1/FVC ratio mean an incentive in coal specialists age bunch between 30-39 years was 113.12%, though the non-coal laborers demonstrates FEV1/FVC ratio mean an incentive between 30-39 years was 110.43%, the FEV1/FVC ratio mean an incentive in coal laborers age amass between 40-49 years was 121.96%, while the non-coal laborers indicates FEV1/FVC ratio mean an incentive between 40-49 years was 110.43% and the FEV1/FVC ratio mean an incentive in coal specialists age gather between 50 &> years was 116.45%, while the non-coal laborers demonstrates FEV1/FVC ratio mean an incentive between 50 &> years was 125.37% as existing in table 2.

The FEF25-75 mean an incentive in coal specialists age assemble between 20-29 was 93.81%, while the non-coal laborers demonstrates FEF25-75 mean an incentive between 20-29 years was 96.53%, the FEF25-75 mean an incentive in coal specialists age gather between 30-39 years was 97.46%, though the non-coal laborers indicates FEF25-75 mean an incentive between 30-39 years was 102.67%, the FEF25-75 mean an incentive in coal specialists age bunch between 40-49 years was 81.83%, though the non-coal specialists indicates FEF25-75 mean an incentive between 40-49 years was 76.25% and the FEF25-75 mean an incentive in coal specialists age aggregate between 50 &> years was 75.86%, while the non-coal specialists indicates FEF25-75 mean an incentive between 50 &> years was 140.0%, which show that the principles of mean created gatherings were dropping in the standard range and criticalness level ( $p < 0.001$ ) as existing in table no.02.

**Table. No 2: Spirometry evaluation in different Age Groups.**

Description	FVC			FEV1			PEFR			FEV1/FVC %			FEF25-75			Friedman's Two-Way Analysis of Variance by Rank (1)
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	
Coal Workers Age Group																
20-29 years	31	57.03	15.58	31	61.77	15.77	31	71.94	23.41	31	110.2	15.13	31	93.81	27.19	0.001
30-39 years	26	58.62	19.42	26	64.15	16.47	26	75.62	22.14	26	113.1	15.88	26	97.46	35.58	0.001
40-49 years	6	53.50	15.73	6	64.50	16.88	6	64.17	20.09	6	121.9	13.43	6	81.83	20.56	0.001
50 &> years	7	52.00	16.47	7	58.86	13.70	7	64.43	24.81	7	116.4	17.71	7	75.86	35.72	0.001
Total	70	56.81	16.98	70	62.60	15.70	70	71.89	22.68	70	112.9	15.58	70	92.34	31.14	0.001
Non-coal workers Age Group																
20-29 years	47	62.02	12.12	47	71.02	13.32	47	83.38	14.73	47	114.7	2.94	47	96.53	27.18	0.001
30-39 years	18	69.94	14.83	18	75.89	14.62	18	87.61	12.33	18	111.7	20.52	18	102.6	19.37	0.001
40-49 years	4	74.50	5.74	4	82.00	5.41	4	85.75	7.274	4	110.4	9.04	4	76.25	15.77	0.001
50 &> years	1	67.00	0.00	1	84.00	0.00	1	84.00	0.0	1	125.3	0.00	1	140.0	0.00	0.001
Total	70	64.84	13.09	70	73.09	13.55	70	84.61	13.71	70	113.8	10.83	70	97.57	25.61	0.001

## DISCUSSION

In this review the assessment of lung capacity through Spirometry in a gathering of coal laborers and non-coal specialists were watched.

The mean vale for FVC gathering of coal laborers for all age gatherings was 56.81 however in the non-coal specialists mean vale for FVC in all age gatherings was 64.84. The both gatherings mean qualities falls beneath the standard esteem .i.e. >80%, however the mean an incentive between non-coal laborers gathering was superior to anything the coal specialists gathering. The mean vale for FEV1 gathering of coal laborers for all age gatherings was 62.60 however in the non-coal specialists mean vale for FEV1 in all age gatherings was 73.09. The mean an incentive between non-coal laborers gathering was enhanced than the coal specialists gathering.

The mean vale for PEFR gathering of coal laborers for all age gatherings was 71.89 however in the non-coal specialists mean vale for PEFR in all age gatherings was 84.61. The PEFR mean an incentive in coal laborers diminish than the non-coal specialists. The mean estimation of coal laborers fall in beneath the standard esteem however the in the non-coal specialists the mean esteem fall in the middle of the standard esteem. The mean vale for FEV1/FVC % gathering of coal laborers for all age gatherings was 112.95 yet in the non-coal specialists mean vale FEV1/FVC % in all age gatherings was 113.87. The anticipated mean estimations of both gatherings were for the most part comparable. The mean vale for FEF25-75 gathering of coal laborers for all age gatherings was 92.34 however in the non-coal specialists mean vale FEF25-75 in all age gatherings was 97.57, the estimation of both gatherings in the middle of the standard yet the non-coal laborers enhanced than coal laborers.

The review was led at USA in 1995, the anticipated mean an incentive for FEV1/FVC % diggers was 106.8 and non-mineworkers 103.8 [19]. Be that as it may, in the present review the mean vale for FEV1/FVC % gathering of coal laborers for all age gatherings was 112.95 yet in the non-coal specialists mean vale FEV1/FVC % in all age gatherings was 113.87. Which demonstrates that the mean an incentive for FEV1/FVC % of present review enhanced than the current review.

The review was led in USA by M-L Wang in 2005, reasoned that the FEV1/FVC % mean an incentive for excavators was 84.8 and for referents the esteem was 89.0 [20]. In any case, in the present review the mean vale for FEV1/FVC % gathering of coal laborers for all age gatherings was 112.95 yet in the non-coal specialists mean vale FEV1/FVC % in all age gatherings was 113.87. Which demonstrates that the consequence of present review opposing with the aftereffect of late review.

The review was directed by William N. ROM in 1980, the mean estimation of FVC was (105.8), FEV1 was (100.8), FEV1/FVC was (76.1) and FEF25-75 was 110.4 [5]. In any case, in the present review the mean estimation of FVC in the coal laborers was (56.81), the mean estimation of FEV1 was (62.60), the mean estimation of FEV1/FVC was (112.95) and the mean estimation of FEF25-75 was (92.34). The mean estimation of FVC and FEV1 in present review the mean esteem were underneath the standard. The mean estimation of FEV1 in the present review was typical and the mean estimation of FEF25-75 in both later and present review fall in standard esteem however the mean estimation of FEF25-75 in the present review was lower than the current review.

## CONCLUSION

Research determined that no significant change found among coal workers and non-coal workers. The mean value of PEFR, FVC and FEV1 were clearly decreased in coal workers than non-coal workers which must be noticed and if it decreased to 50% or lesser had better to be hospitalized in time. More future researches recommended for the safety of coal workers.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author(s) expressed that they have no conflict.

## REFERENCES

1. Zaman, M., S. Ashra, and A. Ashraf, PULMONARY FUNCTION TESTS AND CHEST X-RAY FINDINGS IN COAL-MINE WORKERS WITH RESPIRATORY SYMPTOMS. *Pakistan Journal of Chest Medicine*, 2015. 12(1).
2. Banks, D., The world-wide problem of occupational lung disease. *Occupational lung disease: an international perspective*, Banks DE, Parker JE (Eds.), 1998: p. 3-15.
3. Eschenbacher, W.L., G.J. Kullman, and C.C. Gomberg, Pulmonary effects of inhaled mineral dusts. *Patty's Industrial Hygiene*, 2000.
4. Parkes, W., Pneumoconiosis associated with coal and other carbonaceous materials. *Occupational Lung Disorders*. 3rd ed. L.: Butterworths, 1994: p. 366-368.
5. Rom, W.N., et al., Respiratory Disease in Utah Coal Miners 1-3. *American Review of Respiratory Disease*, 1981. 123(4): p. 372-377.
6. Attfield, M., Longitudinal decline in FEV1 in United States coalminers. *Thorax*, 1985. 40(2): p. 132-137.
7. Marine, W.M., D. Gurr, and M. Jacobsen, Clinically important respiratory effects of dust exposure and smoking in British coal miners. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, 1988. 137(1): p. 106-112.
8. Soutar, C., et al., Important deficits of lung function in three modern colliery populations: relations with dust exposure. *American Review of Respiratory Disease*, 1993. 147(4): p. 797-803.
9. Oxman, A.D., et al., Occupational dust exposure and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a systematic overview of the evidence. *American Review of Respiratory Disease*, 1993. 148(1): p. 38-48.

10. Coggon, D. and A.N. Taylor, Coal mining and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a review of the evidence. *Thorax*, 1998. 53(5): p. 398-407.
11. Montes, I.I., et al., Respiratory disease in a cohort of 2,579 coal miners followed up over a 20-year period. *CHEST Journal*, 2004. 126(2): p. 622-629.
12. Jacobsen, M., et al., The relation between pneumoconiosis and dust-exposure in British coal mines. *Inhaled particles*, 1969. 2: p. 903-919.
13. Morgan, W.K.C., et al., The prevalence of coal workers' pneumoconiosis in US coal miners. *Archives of Environmental Health: An International Journal*, 1973. 27(4): p. 221-226.
14. Christian, R.T., et al., Coal workers' pneumoconiosis: in vitro study of the chemical composition and particle size as causes of the toxic effects of coal. *Environmental research*, 1979. 20(2): p. 358-365.
15. Kibelstis, J.A., et al., Prevalence of Bronchitis and Airway Obstruction in American Bituminous Coal Miners 1, 2. *American Review of Respiratory Disease*, 1973. 108(4): p. 886-893.
- [16]. Morgan, W.K.C., et al., Ventilatory capacity and lung volumes of US coal miners. *Archives of Environmental Health: An International Journal*, 1974. 28(4): p. 182-189.
17. Hankinson, J., et al., Factors influencing expiratory flow rates in coal miners. *Inhaled particles*, 1975. 4: p. 737-755.
18. Attfield, M.D. and T.K. Hodous, pulmonary Function of US Coal Miners Related to past Exposure Estimates. *Am Rev Respir Dis*, 1992. 145: p. 805-809.
19. Petsonk, E., et al., Airway responsiveness and job selection: a study in coal miners and non-mining controls. *Occupational and environmental medicine*, 1995. 52(11): p. 745-749.
20. Wang, M., et al., A prospective cohort study among new Chinese coal miners: the early pattern of lung function change. *Occupational and environmental medicine*, 2005. 62(11): p. 800-805.



54878478451170519



Submit your next manuscript to **IAJPR** and take advantage of:

- Convenient online manuscript submission
- Access Online first
- Double blind peer review policy
- International recognition
- No space constraints or color figure charges
- Immediate publication on acceptance
- Inclusion in **Scopus** and other full-text repositories
- Redistributing your research freely

Submit your manuscript at: [editorinchief@iajpr.com](mailto:editorinchief@iajpr.com)