Review of: "Analysis of Factors Influencing Health and Safety Programme in Selected Electricity Distribution Companies"

Andrew Fournier[1]

1 Grand Canyon University

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article. It appears that the authors have put in significant effort. I have some comments:

The article needs a scrub for English grammar. I noticed some significant errors. The writing could also improve by being much more concise. For example, the first paragraph under section 2.2 could be shortened to two sentences (e.g., *In a study on factors that could influence OHS in construction, Othman et al. (2020) demonstrated the importance of management commitment, safety training, the enforcement of safety rules and regulations, and stakeholders' collaboration. A rather novel theme of the level of technology was also revealed by the respondents.*) All the other information in that paragraph is superfluous. The last paragraph of that section also does not significantly contribute to the article. It could similarly be shortened to two sentences. The removed content would allow space for a broader and deeper review of the literature.

The gap in research needs to be clearly defined. Based on the current research in this realm, what does the authors' article add to the body of knowledge?

It is not clear why the authors provided the Human Factors Theory. If the research questions and hypotheses did not arise from that theory, why does it need to be discussed? I would suggest eliminating those two paragraphs entirely, as well as any other references to the Human Factors Theory. If the research questions/hypotheses are not built from the theory, the theory serves no purpose.

Regarding the hypotheses, typically those need to be addressed after describing the gap in research. The reader does not encounter them until the discussion of the findings. In other words, a discussion of the hypotheses needs to occur earlier in the article.

The authors used an ANOVA test. The reader does not know if the assumptions were met for the ANOVA. This needs to be addressed.

What were the limitations of the research?

What are the recommended directions for future research?

The article is off to a good start, but the authors have significant hurdles in front of them before publication. I look forward to future drafts of the article.