

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_88087
Title of the Manuscript:	Road Safety of Agglomerating Cities in India – Bhubaneswar
Type of the Article	Policy paper / Opinion paper / Research paper

### 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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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	<p>The main topic of the manuscript is actual and very important nowadays. But unfortunately it is very hard to read this manuscript because the English exposition is bad.</p> <p>The manuscript should be formatted according to the requirements (see the requirements for size of font and references citing for example). It is good to explain that so call "black spots" actually are presented as a "green squares" in figures. The manuscript have to be revised with attention on English grammar- there are a lot of sentences that have incorrect structure, such as "A plugin named heat map to identify the accident areas in Bhubaneswar city." and "The results of the hourly volume of traffic during peak hours 9.00AM to 10AM and 6.00PM to 7.00PM analysed." (Learn how to use verb patterns.)</p> <p>The sections "Discussion" and "Conclusion" have to be extended (it is good to be presented detailed discussion on the results which will emphasize on importance of the contributions).</p> <p>There are two figures in the manuscript with number 12 – it is important to be corrected this confusion and also some comments about presented information should to be written. The chosen type of diagram for the first figure 12 is not adequate and thus there are some difficulties to understand its meaning.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Atanaska Bosakova-Ardenska
Department, University & Country	University of Food Technologies, Bulgaria