

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_125527
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF SAFETY PROGRAMMES ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY IN THE OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY IN THE NIGER DELTA AREA, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This is very important for safety management, occupational health and sustainable practices which have are strongly related to employee productivity. In highly risky work environments like the Niger Delta, initiatives of safety programs are very relevant to mitigate associated risks. This manuscript is therefore relevant in assessing such programs, and offering potentials for improvement.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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>Abstract section: You could consider taking out the underlined word in red in the following sentence. This is found within the abstract. For instance, management commitment shows a stronger correlation with productivity in Multinational companies ($r = 0.35$) than <u>in</u> Indigenous firms ($r = 0.15$).</p> <p>Introduction section: You could consider rewriting the following sentence. Organizations depend on a productive workforce, yet inadequate safety measures can hinder productivity, as <u>underscored</u> by the European Employee Productivity Institute in 2019.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. However, the structuring of content in some sections like Materials and methods could be improved.	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are recent and sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Could be improved. I will recommend the use of a tool like Grammarly	
Optional/General comments	The section materials and methods need more clarity and justification of each material and/or method used. For example, descriptive statistics is general. The specific statistics are necessary and for which data which was applied? Also, you talk of a cross-sectional design, I could not see any link with the preceding statement. The structure of the text in this section needs to be improved for better understanding.	

Review Form 3

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:	Princewill Chu Muo
Department, University & Country	Hasselt University, Belgium