



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_43259
Title of the Manuscript:	Risk assessment for Subjective Evidence-Based Ethnography applied in High Risk Environment: Improved Protocol
Type of the 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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>This is an interesting study. The authors aimed to illustrate the context sensitiveness of Subjective Evidence-Based Ethnography (SEBE). The protocol was enriched (version 2.3): 37% items were added. Overall, this study is comprehensive and balanced and manuscript is well-prepared. However, I have some questions, In results regarding the content of the questionnaire, application of methods with users' feedback helped us to improve the 16-question protocol 308 (version 1.1) by adding 6 questions and 3 comments. However, the reliability and validity of the questionnaire is not available in this section. I suggest authors add and discuss the reliability and validity of this questionnaire.</p> <p>In methods, there were seven high-risk professions in this study, including operations pilot, operations technician, maintenance technician, physicians, policemen, air force pilots, and nuclear engineer. The high-risk professions are heterogeneous. I suggest authors discuss the heterogeneity of results in different high-risk professions.</p>	
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wei-Chih Lien
Department, University & Country	College of Medicine, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan