Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_101097**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Analysis of Critical Risk Factors in Five Iconic Major Incidents Using Tripod Beta Analysis Method**
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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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)**	1. **The manuscript is scientifically important specially to prevent accidents and related damages on human being and the environment due to petroleum and chemical industry.** 2. **The title of the article is not properly written it needs some kind of correction** 3. **The abstract lacks well written recommendation** 4. **Subsection and structure of the manuscript are appropriate** 5. **As to my understanding the manuscript is scientifically correct** 6. **The references cited are sufficient and most of them are recent**	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	1. The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications but there are some grammatical, spelling and punctuation mark errors which needs correction	
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:	**Fikrom Gebremedhin**
Department, University & Country	**Ethiopia**