

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_96301
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of Demographic factors on work-related Injuries in the Oil and Gas Industry in The Niger Delta Region in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Suggest conference paper

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.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/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> <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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. NO – there are no new findings and the aim of the write-up did not offer anything new or different from what is in the public domain.</p> <p>2. ok</p> <p>3. somewhat ok</p> <p>4. ok but how the statistical results were used to make a conclusion is flawed – in fact some of the data were nullified by the authors which appears to be based on authors subjective views.</p> <p>5. By balance of probability, yes it is somewhat correct to some extent.</p> <p>6. Not sufficient and recent. Also some assertion made by the author should be attributed to source since this is not based on their findings.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some statements were made that should be referenced since it was not from the authors e.g. "Statistics show that every 15 seconds, one worker dies from a work-related incident, and 153 workers have a work accident" The authors claimed 326 questionnaires were returned from the 450 questionnaires; however, per the demographic criteria in the Table 1, (gender, marital status or contract type) indicated a total of 325.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olatunbosun Ajayi
Department, University & Country	University of Lagos, Nigeria