

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Wed, Nov 14, 2012 at 9:49 AM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: RE: 2012 /BJEMT/ 2391 : Invitation to Review Manuscript for British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade

I have reviewed this paper my decision is to REJECT .

The form you have asked me to fill out does not appear to give me the opportunity to make the comments I want to make, so I include them in this email. You can fit them into the form as you see fit.

I do not wish my identity revealed to the author

COMMENTS

This paper is disappointing. The author appears to be aware of the criticisms of behaviour based safety but chooses to ignore them completely. The main problem with BBS is that it assumes a single cause (violation or mistake), while all recent accident analysis proceeds from the assumption that there are root causes that generate these violations or mistakes. It is just not acceptable to ignore what the critics have said.

But quite apart from this, the methodology is inadequate. The method is basically to ask participants for their views about whether BBS programs have reduced at risk behaviours and whether they have reduced accident rates. There is an enormous problem of confirmation bias in the methodology, that is, people who have been through a program will tend to think that it is effective. The problem could have been overcome if the author had used real data on accident rates, not perceptions of accident rates. This would have required different research design, either accident rates before and after the introduction of BBS, or better, a truly experimental design where BBS was introduced by some companies and not others and the accident rates compared. The researcher seems to have been in a position to organise this kind of experiment.

The difference between questions 2 and 4 and between questions 3 and 5 eludes me. This must have been confusing to participants.

The final methodological problem is that the statistical testing is totally misguided.

Finally the paper has an extensive set of recommendations which do not follow in any way from the research findings.

Note: Anonymous Reviewer

Note: Modification was done in this email ONLY to hide the identity.