



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>In abstract, years are incorrectly mentioned it would be 2001 instead of 2011.</p> <p>Data and variable construction should be clearly defined. Methodological framework is missing.</p> <p>English is too weak and all paper should be in an order to understand fully as in literature it should be from 2002 to onward changes.</p> <p>How safety standards defined and implemented by these selected nations are also missing. Brief historical background of selected nations needs to be added in order to strengthen the study scope. In reference [7] shows 1970-2011 while author use 2001-2007. Why he selected this time period and not afterward</p>	<p>We agree with the reviewer.</p> <p>The study was conducted from 2001 to 2007. The changes were made. Please see the abstract on p. 1.</p> <p>We performed the linear regression and interpreted the results on pp. 7-10 (lines 195-262).</p> <p>Concerning a "brief historical background". This is far beyond what this study is analysing.</p> <p>The years for this study were selected because those were the years that contained appropriate and complete data. This was mentioned in the introduction on p. 1 (lines 21-30), we addressed the scope of these limitations when we were conducting the research.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Why authors selected only eight economies. Needs to define fatal injury occupations.</p> <p>Competing interest issues needs more explanation</p>	<p>On p. 1 (lines 21-30), we addressed the scope limitations that we faced when we were conducting the research.</p>