



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	1. This paper deals with an important OSH issue in Zimbabwe for the improvement of SMEs. The paper should be useful also for other developing countries for policy and training developments. However, the sample size is limited. So, the paper needs more careful description on the findings. 2. In relation to the above point, the usage of "%" should be carefully reviewed and improved to avoid misunderstanding. For example, 350 says "A 50% compliance rate in EMS for LEs as compared to 44.9% in SMEs indicates that LEs are more likely to participate in EMS certification scheme than smaller organizations." This seems to be misleading. 50% here is only 3 LEs among the 6 targets. 3. As another example, 324 says "It was found that risk assessment is also major concern even in LEs; about 66.7% indicated that they did not have a documented risk analysis strategy. Only 16.7% had updated current strategies while 16.7% were using outdated strategies." But here 66.7% means only 4 of 6 enterprises, and 16.7% only 1 of 6. There are many other examples like these. I would recommend that the authors carefully review all the % used, and if appropriate change to more appropriate expressions, for example, by using the real number of enterprises. 4. 156 says "We also aim to find ways of at least bridge the gap between OSH and environmental practices of SMEs and LEs in Zimbabwe." This should be reflected in	The section of LEs has been modified and generalizations have been dropped until the sample has been improved. The current paper is now dealing with the scenario of SMEs only including some qualitative information from key informants. [This decision answers section 2,3 and 4]



SDI Review Form 1.6

	“RESULTS and DISCUSSION” and concrete ideas to make a bridge should be discussed. 5. In 165, METHODOLOGY should show all the questionnaire items and explain how the authors judged. Table 3 gives us some ideas, but is not clear in judgement criteria. For example, in terms of OSH policy statement, 3 SMEs “have it and using it”, while 5 “have it not using” it, and 42 “not have”. How did the authors evaluate these? The same questions apply to the other questionnaire items. Succinct explanation should be added. 6. 351 says “Results from both questionnaires and key informant interviews show that SMEs view OSH policing and EMS certification as costly and that cost of adoption do not outweigh benefits.” However, the information obtained from “key informants” is not systematically described in this paper. A summary table or paragraphs on it should be useful.	Corrected as suggested Included as suggested, but only for SMEs since the paper focus has shifted to SME scenario due to the statistical viability of the number LEs in the study.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Table 3 for SMEs has 12 items, while Table 4 for LEs only 5 items. In terms of the judgement criteria, Table 3 has 3 categories, but Table 4 4 categories. Why? These should be adjusted, or the reasons should be explained. 2. Table 4 mentions “Have it and using it (current)” and “Have it and using it (outdated)”. The criteria of “current” and “outdated” should be explained in the text.	Corrected as indicated Corrected as suggested
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. This paper tends to point negative and disadvantageous aspects of SMEs. However, there are several positive and strong aspects in SMEs, for example, simple decision making structure by owners for quick improvement actions, etc. It is also true that many SMEs around the world have spent efforts to improve OSH by using simple, and low-cost improvement methodologies. The successful SMEs commonly apply simple and practical improvement methodologies. ILO’s WISE training programme is a typical one to support these SME efforts. (Look at http://www.ilo.org/safework/info/instr/WCMS_110322/ang--en/index.htm) I would encourage the authors to consider these positive aspects of SMEs and reflect them in this paper if possible. 2. In relation to the point above, I wonder if the authors have found good practices (even if partial and not perfect) in some SMEs in Zimbabwe during this study. These good practices can be mentioned as a model which should be duplicated in the other SMEs in Zimbabwe.	