Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_110667**
Title of the Manuscript:	**IMPACT OF PROCESS SAFETY CULTURE ON EMPLOYEE SAFETY MOTIVATION IN SELECTED OIL AND GAS INDUSTRIES IN NIGERIA**
Type of the Article	

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 **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1 - The article is interesting for the scientific community, as it researches a relevant topic on process safety culture, using the theory of social exchanges, where the analysis of research with primary and secondary data results in process safety significantly perceived stimulation of personal safety. 2 – The title explained the research well, in my opinion, it could be improved in a more direct way: Impact of safety culture on the motivation of workers in the oil and gas industries in Nigeria. 3 – The summary is comprehensive, making the objective, methodology and result clear. 4 – The literature, methodology and analysis are adequate. Right after the null hypothesis, the three titles can be added; the empirical review paragraph is very long and could be divided. 5 - The publication of the results allows the understanding of what is proposed in the objective of this research. The conclusion and recommendation could be enriched with paragraphs on limitations and suggestions for future research on this topic. 6 – The references were adequate, including recent publications.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The quality of the English language seemed adequate to me.	
Optional/General comments		

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)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Eduardo Dias Leite**
Department, University & Country	**Federal Institute of Brasília, Brazil**