

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_84070
Title of the Manuscript:	Examination of the Causes and Frequency of fire hazard in Communities housing Refinery Flammable Facilities: A Case Study of PHRC
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>)

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, the manuscript is well written and can be considered for publication upon minor revision as suggested above.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstract - please highlight the problem statement in macro and micro levels.</li> <li>Introduction/Background study/Literature Review - Generally, in the Introduction section, authors may give emphasis to different viewpoints and conditionalities to validity in their review. This would provide an instructive presentation of review. In addition, the authors may also rearrange the reviews to accentuate the impact of their laboratory study.</li> <li>Reference – most of the references are outdated. I would reckon to consider some recently published journals related to the subject matter</li> <li>The discussion section needs some improvement. Authors need to analyse their results rather than just simplify it. Don't forget to do complete research on if the results agree or conflict with the previous studies.</li> <li>Additionally, the authors need to evaluate if there are any differences and, if yes, what the differences are. Comparing the development with existing studies helps the research to connect any existing debate. It also offers a solid base of conclusions.</li> <li>Authors should also compare their findings with those of other studies reported in the literature. In comparing, the authors can pronounce the authenticity of the results, especially when similar procedures were used in other studies. Any differences in findings can be explained using the different peculiarities between the author's study and others. If this consideration is carefully made and implemented, the authors may likely find evidence-based explanations for their findings.</li> <li>English needs some improvements. Few grammatical errors</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Azree Othuman Mydin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia</b>