



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	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:

(<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 <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	<p>This paper addresses an important subject on the relationship between national income and occupational injury. However, the paper has not conducted a thorough analysis of this relationship. The author has not also explained well the significance and motivation of this study.</p> <p>The contribution of the paper to the existing body of knowledge is not very significant. However, the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.</p>	<p>We agree with the reviewer. We performed the linear regression and interpreted the results on pp. 7-10 (lines 195-262).</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>(a) Other than presenting the data in graphs and tables, the author could perform some statistical analysis (for example, correlation analysis, regression analysis, etc.) to support evidence that there is a significant relationship between safety performance in a society and the level of national income.</p> <p>(b) Though the study by Smith (2011) is listed in the references, it is not cited in the body of the paper.</p> <p>(c) In the Abstract, "seven year range of 2011 through 2007" should be changed to "the seven year range from 2007 through 2011".</p> <p>(d) In Graphs 2 and 3, the variable measured on vertical axis can be expressed in billions of dollars.</p> <p>(e) Scatter plots showing the relationship between the two variables can be presented to identify if in</p>	<p>(a) The linear regression is performed and interpreted the results on pp. 7-10 (lines 195-262).</p> <p>(b) The study was cited in the body of the paper. It was cited in the introduction on page 1. Please see line 39.</p> <p>(c) The study was conducted from 2001 to 2007. The changes were made. Please see the abstract on p. 1.</p> <p>(d) The changes were made in graphs 2 and 3 on the vertical axis by expressing the dollar values in billions.</p> <p>(e) Instead of scatter plots, we performed the linear regression and interpreted the results on pp. 7-10 (lines 195-262)</p> <p>(f) The limitations were added to the paper.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>fact they are related.</p> <p>(f) Author may consider extending the time period or increasing the number of countries in the sample to better understand the relationship between the two variables.</p> <p>(g) When citing a reference in the body of the paper, the year of publication can be included in parentheses, for example, Park (2011).</p>	<p>On p. 1 (lines 21-30), we addressed the scope limitations that we faced when we were conducting the research</p> <p>(g) The year was included for Park's study on p. 2 (line 60)</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Authors can expand the Introduction and Literature Review sections of the paper.	We expanded the introduction and the literature review. Please see highlighted text on p. 1 (lines 21-30) and p. 3 (lines 101-117)