

## SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

### PART 1:

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_120889</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative Analysis of the Fire and Explosion Risk Assessment in Petroleum Product Handling Facilities in Niger Delta, Nigeria</b>
Type of Article :	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### PART 2:

<b>FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)</b>	<b>Authors' response to final evaluator's comments</b>
<p>This research recommends to the Government Regulators for the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. Carryout effective monitoring of the Petroleum handling facilities in line with the NUPRC Statutory requirements.</li><li>ii. Apply appropriate penalties in line with the law as may be required.</li><li>iii. Insist on compliance with the Law before Permits for siting and operation of petroleum handling facilities are issued.</li></ol> <p>How the authors communicated to the government. If it is not justified, it would be generic. In same way the recommendation should reach The Petroleum Product Marketers otherwise the research wont be useful. If the authors should Find the way to communicate them, it would better</p>	<p>The Authors inform that several works have been published with similar recommendations. However, adjustment has been made to the recommendations as highlighted.</p> <p>On communication with the petroleum marketers, part of the research involved on scene feedback to each facility assessed highlighting shortfalls and other observed HSE non compliances. The non compliances being outside the scope of this paper and thus expunged from the recommendations. It is also expected that the paper will be read and facilities owners implement lessons learnt.</p> <p>The researchers have a scheduled general free training for petroleum marketers in liaison with appropriate regulators which is part of the outcome of this research but out of the scope of this paper.</p>