



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2015_AIR_18021
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of Multiplicative and Additive Hazards Models to Injury Prevention among Healthcare Workers
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Line 81: is confusing. Is the author referring to patients with injuries or does he/she refer to health workers handling patients with injuries or health workers who have injuries. This should come out clearly. Same applies to line 85</p> <p>Line 153: Number the equation <math>h(t z) = h_0(t) + \emptyset(Z)</math> as equation (3)</p> <p>Line 170: I propose you continue numbering i.e (4) instead of (1)</p> <p>Line 179: Number the equation. The same applies to line 210, 211, 212, 216, 219 and 221</p> <p>Line 198: the last part of the expression with labda is incomplete, may be the word format of the author or mine!</p> <p>Line 254: The date of completion of the study is provided. What about the commencement of the study?</p> <p>Line 335: instead of "there are various solutions...." I propose "there are various alternatives....."</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your valuable comments and suggestions. I incorporated them in the paper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lines 81, 85: The study subjects are health workers who have injuries. Clarified in the text.</li> <li>• Lines 153, 170, 179, 210, 211, 212, 216, 219, 221 were correctly numbered.</li> <li>• Line 198: word "such as" is missing.</li> <li>• Line 254: the study duration was inserted.</li> <li>• Line 335: fixed.</li> </ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Line 18: "In this study <b>the</b> performance" (include the)</p> <p>Line 19: instead of "using an injury", i propose "in an injury"</p> <p>Key words: Try as much as you can to avoid words and phrases in the title</p> <p>Line 104; instead of "with this example" i propose "With this data set"</p> <p>Line 105 &amp; 107: i propose the paragraph to remain the way it is but delete (i) and (ii)</p> <p>Line 241: Why use SAS and R not one?</p> <p>Line 263: in response to the results obtained, its appropriate also in Table 1 to show the estimates and the p-value of interaction effect</p> <p>Line 309: I'm curious!, what is your interpretation of this</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Line 18, 19: fixed.</li> <li>• Key words were changed as you suggested.</li> <li>• Line 104, 105 &amp; 107: fixed.</li> <li>• Line 241: only R provides Figure 3a-3c of the Aalen's additive model, thus we use SAS and R both for this project.</li> <li>• Line 263: since interaction effect was not significant and thus we decided not to include in the final model.</li> <li>• Line 309: Concave shape just indicates lack of model fit. Because the sample size of that group is small, it is not</li> </ul>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	concave shape? Line 339: "From a practical point...."	unexpected to observe deviation from the 45 degree slope. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Line 339: fixed.</li></ul>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	It is a very well presented manuscript, the problem being addressed stands out clearly, the methodology is statistically very sound and the results are obtained and well presented. In your future research, try to explore the failure law your data follow. I.e. is it exponential, weibull or log-logistic? Otherwise the work is quite recommendable.	In this paper we compared additive models to the Cox semi-parametric model. It is good idea to extend comparing additive models presented here to parametric models (exponential, Weibull, log-logistic, and piecewise exponential), as you suggest. Thank you for your suggestion!