



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2012 /BJEMT/ 2391
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF BEHAVIOUR-BASED SAFETY IN ACCIDENT PREVENTION IN THE BONNY NLNG CONSTRUCTION PROJECT, NIGERIA

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

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

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Manuscript consisted a lot of repetition: In abstract the connection of behaviour-based safety and accidents are in three times, Objectives, research questions and hypothesis (page 4-5) are the same. Dr. Geller's contribution was mentioned two times. What the employees know about BBS and how is guaranteed their knowledge? (page 11) Where comes at-risk behaviours and accidents? There is no elaboration about the effect of possible third element on correlation.	The repetitions in the manuscript has been eliminated in the revised manuscript see the new objectives, research questions and hypotheses inline 74 -95. The abstract has also been restructured to remove repetitions see the revised abstract. Dr. Geller's contribution that was mentioned two times in the old manuscript has been reduced to once in the revised manuscript see line 44-45. The information on page 11 of the old manuscript has been restructured in the revised manuscript see table 2 line 248 of the revised manuscript. The correlation method of hypothesis testing in the old manuscript has been replaced with chi-squared in the revised manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	The results (page 12-13) included same information than Table 2. There are too many recommendations (page 16-17). There is a reference missing from Geller (page 3, line 64). A reference missing from Figure 2.	The information in table 2 of the revised manuscript is explained in the following paragraph using percentages (see line 250-269). The recommendations has been consolidated to eight in the context of the paper see line 327- 338.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		The reference missing from Geller in the old manuscript (page3, line64) has been inserted in the revised manuscript see (Atkinson, 2005) in line 45 of the revised manuscript. The reference missing from Figure 2, in the old manuscript has been inserted in the revised manuscript see (Heinrich, H.W. Industrial Accident Prevention: A Scientific Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950), in line 168-169.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Many of references are old.	Some old references were used because there are still relevant in the context of the research paper and provision of appropriate theoretical framework.