



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_51242
Title of the Manuscript:	Vulnerability of Local Communities to Oil Installation in Isoko Local Government Area of Delta State, Nigeria
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	What is the total population of the studied area? How many percent of 600 respondents out of the total population? Where is their location or home relative to the oil installation? What is their employment data or information? Are they represents the total community or population? In this type of study, all these information are important to make sure the samples will represent the total population and should be included in the study. There are some figures without elaboration, referred or mentioned in the text. All figures must be used in the manuscript. Where is figure 4.6?	Correction effected
Minor REVISION comments	Numbering of the figures should be based on their usage order, i.e. the first reference cite din the text should be number 1 etc.	Noted
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is based on the simple study with unclear and little respondents. It is better if the study used open ended questionnaire instead of guided with multiple choice answers. This type of approach will not give the accurate results of the scenario. The simple should be big enough to represent the population. The manuscript can be consider for further action if the respondents clearly represent the population and the approach used open ended questionnaire which will give the respondent to give their own opinion so that the results and conclusion will reflect the actual scenario.	Effected

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	