

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_129965
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantification and Analysis of Human Errors across the Life Cycle of Electrical Installations
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive analysis of human errors across the life cycle of electrical installations, a critical aspect often overlooked in power systems management. By categorizing electrical faults and associating them with various human interventions at different life cycle stages, the study offers valuable insights for improving system reliability, safety, and performance. The findings can guide industries in implementing targeted measures to mitigate human-related errors, thereby reducing downtime, enhancing operational efficiency, and preventing accidents.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
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.	The abstract of the article is mostly comprehensive, as it provides an overview of the research objectives, methodology, key findings, and significance of the study.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The classification of faults across different life cycle stages (design, assembly, inspection, operation, and maintenance) is logical, and the approach to linking human errors to specific fault types is scientifically sound. Additionally, the inclusion of practical implications, such as improving safety, reliability, and quality management, aligns with current industry needs. Overall, the manuscript demonstrates a solid understanding of the subject and provides valuable insights for both academic researchers and industry professionals.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	While many references are relevant, some are relatively old (e.g., Lisboa, 1988; Floyd, 1986). It may be beneficial to include more recent studies (within the past 5–10 years) on human error in power systems, electrical safety, and risk management.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Ensure consistency in the use of terms such as "electrical installation" vs. "electrical equipment" and "life cycle" vs. "lifecycle."	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the manuscript is scientifically sound and presents a structured analysis, but minor revisions in terms of language, recent references, and sentence fluency would enhance its scholarly communication. here do not appear to be any ethical issues in this manuscript. The study is based on secondary data collected from credible sources such as books, government standards, and published research papers, which are appropriately cited. There do not appear to be any competing interest issues in this manuscript.	

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:	Prabhakar N. Kota
Department, University & Country	MES'S Wadia College of Engineering, India