

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_95803
Title of the Manuscript:	Organizational Factors and Safety Performance Levels Among Workers in Local and Multinational Oil and Gas Companies in The Niger Delta Region of Nigeria
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)
<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>1. The manuscript was considered important enough for the scientific community as far, I think.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3. It is comprehensive enough</p> <p>4. Simply, the subsection and structure of this manuscript are appropriated as instructed.</p> <p>5. Yes, I do think so</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and around 95% of them stand of more than teen year of edition age.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes the language is communicable enough</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall this article was good, but there were a few things that needed to be clarified, namely :</p> <p>1. What is the main aim of the authors to compare organizational factor levels and safety performance among workers in local and multinational oil and gas companies in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria.</p> <p>2. What are the benefits and contributions that can be made from the results of this study, especially towards improving the quality and quantity of the factors studied for local oil and gas companies.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	H. Sudiyono
Department, University & Country	IKIP Siliwangi, Indonesia