



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_47762
Title of the Manuscript:	Health Hazards Associated With Operations of Medium-Scale Dual Purpose Kerosene Vendors Using Motorized Pumps With Aboveground Storage Tanks in Ilorin Metropolis, Kwara State.
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add 'Nigeria' to the title. 2. The manuscript needs editing. 3. Follow Journal's manuscript format ting guidelines. 4. Check the referencing style used. Should be the accepted one. 5. Early on inform the reader on the difference/similarity among oil, petroleum and kerosene and why the study decided to focus on kerosene Vs the other two? In other words disentangle hazards from each. No evidence provided of kerosene exploding!! See K48. Could kerosene hazards in Nigeria or elsewhere be quantified? 6. What gap did this study aim to fill – the study problem OR what is the knowledge contribution gained from this study that is 'new'?? Stating the problem clearly will add to the quality of this manuscript. 7. What did the researcher(s) do to ensure that participants were comfortable reporting on illegal activities they were engaged in? The ethics considered. 8. Stated that the owners and the sales persons were interviewed. However, the number of respondents and DPKs are the same (76). Does this mean that all DPKs were owner-operated OR vice versa??? Is there a case where both the owner and the salesperson were interviewed? 9. Are regulation for installing filling stations and stand alone DPKs the same in Nigeria? If not, then focus on DPK regulations. 10. Author(s) may need to refer to Journal's guidelines on use of (coloured) figures. 11. Having a discussion section would improve the quality of this manuscript. If agreed, move discussion-like data/information from the results section as suggested. 12. Author(s) should b e conversant with the use and interpretation of Chi square. Table 1.6. 13. Conclusions and recommendations made should base on results from the study; not otherwise!!!! 14. Address which institution/body/individual is/are responsible for implementing recommendations made. 15. Write recommendations in a paragraph form. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Manuscript editing is mandatory.	
Optional/General comments	If reworked as suggested, this is a good and original study for publication.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with
--	--------------------	----------------------------------



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<i>reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<i><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i> <u>What did the researcher(s) do to ensure that participants were comfortable reporting on illegal activities they were engaged in?</u>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Switbert Rwechungura Kamazima</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Tanzania</i>