



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>(1) The symbol “FOI(Line 185)” 、 “Rate of FOI(Line 193)” and “Rate FOI(Line 197)” are means “Rate of Fatal Occupational Injury” , so need the unified notation.</p> <p>(2) Line 197: The linear regression model is “$FOI=1.856 - 5.162E-13 GDP + 0.002 Cases FOI$”, the same modification as the linear regression model in Line 209. And some wrong explains about $5.162E-13$ and $4.010E-11$, et al.</p> <p>(3) Line 209: The coefficient “-0.005” is unreasonable. And the explains about the second regression equation is far-fetched.</p>	<p>(1) Lines 183, 185, 193, 205 (it was 197), & 223 (it was 209): “Rate FOI” was chosen as the unified notation, and the charges were made accordingly in those lines.</p> <p>(2) Lines 205 (it was 197) & 223 (it was 209): The linear regression model was changed to “Rate FOI=$1.856 - 5.162E-13 GDP + 0.002 Cases FOI$” and “Rate FOI =$19.036+4.010E-11 GDP - 0.005 Cases FOI$”. Explanations were made about the values of $5.162E-13$ and $4.010E-11$ on lines 199-205 up to Table 3, and other explanatory paragraphs were inserted within lines 217-221 and 224-232 up to Table 6.</p> <p>(3) Line 223 (it was 209): All data in SPSS were verified that there were no negative numbers. Then the regression model results were rerun and verified. The explanations about the second regression equation were changed on lines 224-232 up to Table 6.</p>