

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_CJAST_93609 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluation of Workers Participation in Risk Assessment of Underwater Operations in the Oil and Gas Industry |
| 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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript needs review for the English language, grammar and syntax 2. Details about the Oil and Gas companies in the study area (national as well as multinational) can be added in the introduction/methods part 3. Brief details about the ISO 19900.... Standards, based on which the questionnaire was developed should be explained in brief in the methods part. Similarly, how the risk assessment practice was assessed also needs to be included in the methods part 4. Selection of the companies and participants from the companies should be included in the methods 5. The response rate of >95% has been mentioned in the abstract part but not in the main manuscript, and how is the response rate calculated? 6. The manuscript needs to mention ethical clearance | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While explaining statistical inference in the manuscript, only p values can be mentioned and to omit Chi-square and d.f. statistics 2. Only relevant information should be included in the results part and repetition of the text should be avoided. 3. Only relevant percentages should be included in the tables to avoid congested tables and similarly, statistical tests for the particular table can be merged with that table and only relevant statistics should be included (like the chi-square, and p-value utilised for that cross-table) and other theoretical parts can be omitted. 4. Findings of married workers are more committed to carrying out a risk assessment that has been mentioned only in the discussion part – needs to be based on research findings. 5. References should be cited for the literature in Paragraphs 2 and 3 in the introduction part. 6. Findings need to be compared with similar studies locally as well as globally | |
| Optional/General comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These workers were trained/retrained for risk assessment training? And if yes, and details are available, risk assessment practice should be compared between different categories of workers as well as with their risk assessment training (and frequency of training) status. | |

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) |
|---|---|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> No information was provided regarding the ethical clearance of the research</p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Name: | Ashish Trivedi |
| Department, University & Country | Brunei |