

Review Form 3

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

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document offers a comparative assessment of risk of more than 100 petroleum processing facilities in Nigeria's Niger Delta, with an emphasis on the facilities' physical locations, the kinds of petroleum products they sell, and the kinds of operators. • To assess the fire and explosion hazards related to these facilities, the study makes use of robust statistical approaches in conjunction with qualitative risk analysis methods. • All things considered, the study tackles a pertinent and significant issue in the area of petroleum safety, especially in an area recognized for its oil output. • Nevertheless, the work has to be revised before publishing due to a number of strengths and shortcomings. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>A comparative examination of the risk assessment for fire and explosion in petroleum product handling facilities located in Niger Delta, Nigeria</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Important highlights could be mentioned.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the study adapts a standardised checklist, more information about the specific criteria used for evaluating compliance and safety measures would strengthen the methodology. It is unclear how various parameters were prioritised or weighted in the risk assessment process. • The study includes 118 facilities across three cities, but the distribution of facilities among these cities is uneven. Port Harcourt has a significantly higher count (72 facilities), which may skew the results. A more balanced sample or justification for the distribution would enhance the robustness of the analysis. • While tables are effectively used, the manuscript lacks figures or diagrams (aside from the map of the Niger Delta) that could visually represent key findings or conceptual frameworks, particularly in the discussion section. 	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important information about the risks of explosions and fires in petroleum handling facilities in the Niger Delta region is included in this manuscript. • The study contains a number of strengths, such as a sound methodological framework and an understandable findings presentation, but it also has some significant flaws that should be fixed. • This manuscript could significantly advance the field of petroleum risk and safety management with minor adjustments to methodology, analysis, and clarity. • The present analysis assesses the known fire and explosive risks related to these facilities. It does not, however, offer any potential ways to reduce these hazards. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Recent three-year references may be included</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dinakaran D
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Technology, India