



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_47324
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge and Attitudes on Practices of Occupational Safety and Health in the Informal Non-food Manufacturing Sector in Kampala City, Uganda
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Vague definition on "informal non-food manufacturing sector", required further explanation.</li> <li>● The objective of the study is weakly justified, need further explanation.</li> <li>● It seems there are not enough literatures to support this research.</li> <li>● The study design and setting need more elaboration.</li> <li>● Lack of justification of choosing specific research method and design.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Literature review is not well organized.</li> <li>● Explain briefly the reason of using cluster sampling.</li> <li>● The discussion section is considered well written and supported with previous studies.</li> <li>● The discussion is written based on the analysed results, however, lack of recommendation given in conclusion.</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The topic is interesting, and the results are considered soundness for this research. However, in overall, the significant and gap of the study was not clearly explained; editing and proofreading is highly recommended.	

**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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yeong Sook Shuen</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM), Malaysia</b>