

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_108248
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSING THE AWARENESS, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE OF LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS STATIONS WORKERS TO FIRE EMERGENCY RESPONSE IN IKOTUN, LAGOS.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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>LPG is an extremely combustible and potentially dangerous chemical. LPG stations are susceptible to fire incidents, which can result in substantial property damage, injuries, and fatalities. Comprehending the readiness and reaction of employees at such facilities is essential for guaranteeing the safety of both workers and the neighboring community. This research is crucial for ensuring the safety of both LPG station personnel and the nearby community, for adhering to regulations, and for enhancing knowledge on fire emergency prevention and response in this sector.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable for its content. Furthermore, the study substantiated the title keywords by presenting empirical data, which was consistently present throughout the entire manuscript. I have identified some corrections to the manuscript's title, which I have underlined.</p> <p>The abstract of this paper is reasonably thorough and demonstrates a moderate degree of reflection and deliberation. However, there are a few minor adjustments that have been highlighted in red in the document.</p> <p>The subsections of the manuscript are adequate and appropriate for their intended objectives. However, the manuscript did not contain distinct parts that addressed the specific goals of the investigation especially in the methodology.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The introduction presented a well-thought-out hypothesis for the study. I suggest that the authors should perform a comprehensive reconstruction of the literature review to highlight the parts that are relevant to the hypothesis.</p> <p>The methodology that was used is appropriate but not well written coherently. The procedures have been described in sufficient detail. However, there are no subsections, and it makes this part very difficult to comprehend at a glance. I suggest you break it down and let your instrument for data collection, experimental design choices, and statistical analysis be well spelled out.</p> <p>The tables were meticulously crafted, and their incorporation enhanced the understanding of the research findings. However, I dislike the direct adoption of inferential tables from SPSS. The authors should construct their tables in a manner that accurately and logically represents the hypothesis.</p> <p>The authors drew acceptable findings in the conclusion section, aligning with the study's objectives. The future recommendations were thoroughly assessed.</p> <p>Also, the manuscript is very well written; it gives a profound summary of the theoretical background and determines the scientific implications of the data in an adequate manner. Major revisions in the areas highlighted in the manuscript are highly needed.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The writers utilized more than 30 publications cited in recent editions of international scientific journals as references. The inclusion of these references in the "Introduction" and "Discussion" sections indicates a comprehensive, current, and moderately thorough understanding of the relevant literature.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English employed is sufficiently lucid to be deemed satisfactory, and it effectively utilizes scientific vocabulary. Furthermore, it is quite apparent that there are spelling and grammar issues that require careful examination and rectification.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>There are significant corrections that need to be addressed, which have been underlined and discussed in the preceding sections.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Obodo Basil Nnaemeka</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Ambrose Alli University, Nigeria</p>