



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012 ACSj 2759
Title of the Manuscript:	Occupational safety and environmental risks scenario of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs): An analysis of the situation in Harare chemical industries, Zimbabwe

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- the introduction section is too long. It covers approx. 4 pages. To my knowledge, the introduction of a scientific manuscript should be concise (max 800 words), provide the background on the subject addressed and highlight the paper aim. In this paper, the introduction includes a detailed description of the Zimbabwean economy. I would suggest to restructure the introduction following the guidelines provided above, and move the description of the Zimbabwean economy to a new section; - in Table 1, the type of companies interviewed is not clear. You have previously stated the overall sample of companies for your study consists of 100 chemical enterprises, which is not consonant with the results in Table 1. Probably, some explanation is missed here. Please clarify; - also, I cannot understand what you mean by "substitute" companies. How were those companies identified? What is their role? Why do you need substitute companies if you already have 100 enterprises to interview? And, most important, are substitute companies equally reliable as the remaining sample companies? - on the same point, it is not clear what you mean by "Out of the original sample frame of 100, 71% of the companies could not be located". Why were you unable to locate the companies? Do they no longer exist? - a reference is required to support the sentence	The introduction has been adjusted as recommended The original sample <u>frame</u> had 100 companies, the intention was to interview all of them. Table 1 shows the number eventually interviewed. This has been explained as recommended. The concept of substitute interviews/ companies came due to the fact that SMEs location was problematic as most SMEs no longer existed, may be due to the fact that they had been shut down or relocated and their current address could not be established. They had the same characteristics as those on the original sample frame save for the fact that they were not affiliate members or had been involved with the industrial associations from where we obtained the sample frame. The term substitute here only describes an SMEs not originally on the sample frame which can be interviewed in case one sme on original sample frame cannot be found.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	“Chemical safety cannot be guaranteed without a policy. Policy is a core element of safety management”. - technically, the statistics you provide for large enterprises (LE) on table 4 cannot be considered as reliable. Your sample of LE only includes 6 companies, which is too few to allow deriving any general conclusion. For instance, looking at table 4, I see that you found several “0” values: e.g., 0 large enterprises do not have documentation on OSH policy statement. However, this does not allow concluding that LE always have documentation for OSH policy statement, because of the scarcity of LE in your analysis. The same happens for the remaining values proposed in Table 4. This is a main issue, because it jeopardises the results of your study; - again, from the technical point of view, to ensure that there is a difference between SME and LE in the approach to chemical safety, some statistical tests would be required. This is not performed in this study. Why? - Conclusions of the paper are very weak. They need to be restructured. Implications of the study, contribution, limitations, and future research directions should be included.	A reference has been included as suggested The section of LEs has been modified . a description of the information obtained is now given without generalization. LE performance is now described as their performance in a relaxed regulation or policy free environment. However the current paper is now focuses on the scenario of SMEs. Considered - LEs and their comparison with SMEs has been dropped for this current paper as indicated in comment above. The conclusion has been corrected as suggested.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- the definition of large enterprises is unclear. I quote: "In this study a Large Enterprise (LE) is an organization that has more than 300 employees. In Zimbabwe, most LEs are operating at 40% capacity due to the economic meltdown affecting the country". I am not an expert of Zimbabwean economy, hence I do not know if more precise definitions of LE are available for that country. In Europe, the European Commission has definite precisely small, medium and large enterprises, with a proper set of guidelines. Do any guidelines for the definition of company's size exist for your country? Please explain;	No guidelines exist, the definitions we use are based on common classifications in literature. Due to the recent political and economic situation sizes of companies have been affected. Number of employees may have been cut down by 40%. After this cut we decided to involve the LEs though affected still have more than 300 employees. The issue of LEs has been sidelined and have to correct statistical issues back in the field the write another paper with that necessary comparison.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	None	