

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_90513
Title of the Manuscript:	ROAD SAFETY AUDIT: A CASE STUDY ON (NH-326)
Type of the Article	

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

<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correct Reference 1 citation. 2. Image 1 and Figures 1-4 appear to be taken from other sources – an image of a road map in the case of Image 1 and screenshots from a web site in Figures 1-4. The sources of these figures should be referenced. 3. The abstract and introduction refer to “loop areas” as being a particular concern for safety. The specific usage of the term and its relevance to the rest of the paper is unclear (at least to me). It would be good to explain this a bit further. Is NH-326 a loop area? 4. There needs to be a greater connection between Sections III, IV and V of the paper for this paper to be relevant to a general audience. The description of how an RSA is performed in III is good. But what are we to make of the accident data in Section IV – how does it impact anything? The cataloguing of safety issues in V is good as a demonstration of the kinds of issues an RSA may identify, and hopefully will be useful for making NH-326 safer. However, for a general audience the specific details are irrelevant. It would be better to show examples of the recommendations that result from each step of the RSA outlined in III. I think the material is there – it just needs to be presented in a more useful way. 	<p>I wasn't able to find Reference 1 at the URL provided in the paper but did find it here: https://morth.nic.in/sites/default/files/PragatiKiNayiGati/odisha/files/assets/basic-html/page-1.html#</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>There are numerous minor spelling and grammatical issues throughout the paper. They did not impede understanding of the material. However, ideally these would be corrected by the author or editors prior to publication.</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<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> <p>NO</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	William Robert
Department, University & Country	USA