



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_11157
Title of the Manuscript:	The Relationship between National Income and Occupational Injury
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:

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



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Line 25; article did touched on 'robust regulatory', however not much explanation was given esp the differences on safety std btw developed mkt vs emerging mkts, whereas this is crucial factor in determining the issue of injury.</p> <p>Line 106; Graph 1: graph only provides general view on factors but without clear relationship btw Injury, factors & consequences. Eg how does GDP related to Injury @ safety std? The graph should clearly show the link btw these variables ie how GDP & safety Std have an inverse/negative associations with injury, snc this study intend to prove such relationship.</p> <p>Line 103; may be other factors are more relevance to link with injury eg level of edu/qualification among employees; degree of safety enforcement, type of employees – skilled, unskilled...etc</p> <p>Line 170; ...a significant relationship – how do v measure this..is it only via secondary data of all countries involved? Whereas there is no statistical test was made....it would be better if only ...'an association' @ relationship....is suffice.</p>	<p>We agree with the reviewer on the following issues:</p> <p>Referring to Line 25. We provided the explanation about the difference on safety standards between developed and emerging markets. Please see highlighted text on p. 3 (lines 101-117).</p> <p>Referring to Line 106. We performed the linear regression and interpreted the results pp. 7-10 (lines 195-262).</p> <p>Referring to Line 103. As stated in lines 26-30. This study is not attempting to address all variables but rather a causal link of GDP and fatal injury.</p> <p>Referring to Line 170. A linear regression was performed and we interpreted the results on pp. 7-10 (lines 195-262).</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall can be improve & acceptable	