

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_86585
Title of the Manuscript:	Causes of Cement Trucks Accidents on the Major Routes Connecting Obajana Cement Plant and Rivers State in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1.The title of the study is o.k. The topic selected is relevant. The operational definitions of the concepts are not given in the study which are to be given in the introduction part.</p> <p>2. In the abstract the terms majority has been used for the percentage which is less than 50. While using the terms majority or most, it is better to ensure that the percentage is more than 50.</p> <p>3. The study is presented in a logical sequence and the research methodology followed has been clearly stated. However, the significance of the study or statement of the problem is missing which is very important for any study. This is to be show after introduction.</p> <p>4. Under the heading sample size-there is repetition of the same paragraph beginning with-" where n is the sample size.....and Route3(23).</p> <p>5. The researcher could derive at a better conclusion if 5 point scale or rank order questions were used in the questionnaire.</p> <p>6. Try to avoid yes or no questions in the questionnaire as it does not help in deriving a meaningful conclusion. In the present study the analyses are based on Yes or no answers .So the findings and conclusions are not much reliable .</p> <p>7. Hypotheses were not set in the present study. For a study like this which is mainly based on primary data , setting of hypothesis is a must.</p> <p>8. Review of literature is o.k. and done correctly.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	No grammar mistakes in the study.	

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:	Santha S
Department, University & Country	St. Peter's College, India