



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_52071
Title of the Manuscript:	APPLICATION OF CAUSE-AND-EFFECT-ANALYSIS FOR EVALUATING CAUSES OF FIRE DISASTERS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN ILORIN METROPOLIS, 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>)



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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>-Introduction needs to be revised and improved. The author may consider reading more articles on related fields or subjects.</p> <p>-Line 502 to 504 Reframe and restructure the introduction for this section. Not good enough. There must be results on number of respondents attributing root causes to the interpretations listed and discussed in the key interpretation section. Key interpretations listed in line 505 and so on is like a key/legend. Needs to be clarified as to how we arrived at those interpretations</p> <p>-The fishbone diagram needs to be re-looked at. There is no spine and related captions for its head, tail, bones and how they could be liaised to root causes, sub-causes and implications/effects. This is essential for readers to easily grasp the whole concept.</p> <p>- There is no results/data from the questionnaires administered as stated in the methodology to support the key interpretations and discussions.</p> <p>-Line 727-729 must be reframed to be clearer and more concise. Were the solutions proposed by respondents or target population? If so must be stated and outlined as such.</p> <p>-Line 730: Caption must be revised.</p> <p>-Line 764, 769 and other sub- sections highlighted under problems and solutions. Kindly revise sections for the solutions and back them up with data. They need to be revised thoroughly. I suggest the authors to read more about structure and composition of developing manuscripts on related fields/subject.</p> <p>-Entire manuscript needs to be proofread to check for grammatical errors/tenses, punctuations and so on.</p> <p>-Conclusion needs to be revised and properly written</p> <p>- References and citations must conform to the journal's format. Kindly check the correct format and do so accordingly (Author, year. Title of paper/book....name of publisher/institution, city/country the paper was published. In some cases you could add the link)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>-Research designs are limited to case study scenarios, longitudinal, cross-sectional, comparative studies and so on. So in this case, strategy or approach is the right word instead of design (Line 13)</p> <p>- It would be helpful if the causes listed could be paraphrased to highlight or make readers know what primarily is/are the major causes of fire-outbreaks in Private and Public secondary schools (Line 20).</p> <p>-Line 128: Fortified??? In this context I suggest you use another word since it may not be appropriate.</p> <p>- Line 223: Since it's about the study area, it could have a subsection header like: Study</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Area right after the materials and methods.</p> <p>-Line 333: I would suggest that if you would not include map of the study area in the text, you need not to include ...map of the study area. I humbly suggest to you to include a header section entitled "study area" after the materials and methods, then you can include map of the study area to make the sentence in line 333 valid else you need to omit it since there is no map in your text.</p> <p>-Line 397-399: -Why did you choose this sampling methodology? Any justification?</p> <p>-In what way does this validate information given by respondents?</p> <p>-Does this technique make or justify the target group as true representation of the entire students, teachers and head of institutions in PPSS in Llorin metropolis?</p> <p>- The steps could be placed in a box with a caption beneath it.</p> <p>-Long/Lengthy sentences. Try to break them or make them simple and concise.</p> <p>-Kindly take note of highlighted text in red fonts and comment buttons to consider the suggestions or comments to improve your manuscript. Very necessary!!!</p> <p>-Must be backed by data not just stating it (Line 724 and 725).</p>	
Optional/General comments	Major comments highlighted above needs to be considered and worked on accordingly to improve the manuscript. Thereafter it could be considered for publication.	

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:	Isaac Sarfo
Department, University & Country	Nha Trang University, Vietnam