

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_110799
Title of the Manuscript:	Modelling safety behaviour from safety climate among healthcare workers in Benin City
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community yet there are a lot of flaws in the paper.</p> <p>The title is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract lacks the future research opportunities (gap).</p> <p>This manuscript lacks literature review. The author should add literature review section.</p> <p>More recent citation (no more than 5 years) should be added.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are some grammatically error in the entire manuscript. The author should ask for an English editing service to fine tune his/her manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no research question in the introduction section. - There is no expected benefit from this research in the introduction section. - Sample size is not correct. According to Taro Yamane formula, the number of sample size can never be less than 380 but the author stated that the sample size was only 277. Correct this issue otherwise I cannot recommend for the publication. - There is no IOC rating regarding the detail of the questionnaire. Therefore, the validity of the instrument is questionable. - Please state the reason why using Varimax Orthogonal Rotation in analysis section. - This paper lacks factor loadings table. Please correct this issue otherwise I cannot recommend for the publication. - Research hypothesis is super weak. There are a lot of independent variables (management commitment (MC), supportive environment (STE), supervisory environment (SE), workers involvement (WI), and personal appreciation of risk (PR)) but there is only one hypothesis stated that management commitment impact positively on safety behavior. - There is no future research opportunities in this paper. 	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pattarachat Maneechaeye
Department, University & Country	Thailand