

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104139
Title of the Manuscript:	Workplace risk assessment in the automobile sector of Uttarakhand
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	This manuscript does not give much benefit for scientific community This article is a study with a descriptive design It is only describes conditions based on respondents' answers. So, perhaps a more appropriate title would be a workplace risk assessment description in the automobile sector of Uttarakhand It is okay The structure is incomplete, because there is no literature review. But it depends on the style of the publisher The underlying theory is unclear The population is not clear, so that the areas and samples selected purposively and randomly do not clearly represent who. Limited references	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is enough	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hunik Sri Runing Sawitri
Department, University & Country	Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia