

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

John Nsikan¹

1 Covenant University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

An investigation into the factors that influence health and safety programs in an organization is crucial, given the current desire to achieve SDGs 3 and 8 (i.e., **Good Health and Well-being**, and **Decent Work and Economic Growth**), which emphasizes creating safe and secure working environments and ensuring the health and well-being of workers. Therefore, the topic merits research attention.

However, the following issues that need correction might impede the credibility and reproducibility of the paper:

- 1. The title is so open that one is at a loss about its actual objective or intention. For instance, are you interested in determining the factors influencing the choice of a specific health and safety program by the organization or the factors influencing the effectiveness of the chosen health and safety programs? This has to be clearly defined in the Title and throughout the paper.
- 2. It is not clearly shown in the introduction what the rationale for the study is. Thus, its novelty is either doubtful or completely nonexistent. Authors should include a paragraph or two justifying the necessity for the paper and the new contributions to knowledge it is likely to make to the employee health and welfare literature.
- 3. There is a clear need to explain how the chosen theory (GFA theory) is being applied to the study, drawing out its practical benefits and criticisms if any.
- 4. In section 2.2-Empirical review, the authors have not been able to show the point of departure or difference between the reviewed papers and their proposed study. Existing gaps should be clearly shown.
- 5. The Methodology section did not indicate the proposed statistical tools for the study. There is a need to perform a Factor Analysis for this study. In addition, a paragraph that shows instrument reliability and validity is important.
- 6. Create a separate section for "**Results and Discussion**" and ensure that the major findings (both descriptive and inferential) are thoroughly discussed, either refuting or supporting prior studies reported in the empirical review, i.e., section 2.2.
- 7. The modern way of presenting questionnaire items in the descriptive data analysis section is to summarise them using a single term that represents a factor. For instance, The following statements in Table 4.4 "Workers' noncompliance influences the health and safety programme", There is low commitment from top mgt, and There is negligence on the part of the employees toward the health and safety programme" can be recast as follows: *Noncompliance from workers, low level of top management commitment, and employee negligence*. Using the examples, the authors



- should adjust all others in Tables 4.2 to Table 4.4.
- 8. The method of performing regression analysis is not correct. The source of predictors used for Table 4.7 is not clear. They should have been defined initially in the methodology section to indicate the variables/proxies that are being measured. Therefore, the authors should include the measurement of variables in the methodology section.
- 9. "Based on the findings from Table 4.5 to Table 4.8 in this study, however, it is scientifically justifiable to reject null hypothesis one, which states that "there are no significant factors influencing the health and safety program of the selected electricity distribution companies in Nigeria." Where in the manuscript are hypotheses one and two stated? Why is the discussion of findings based on Tables 4.5 and 4.8 alone? What happens to the other findings in Tables 4.2, 4.3, etc.? They should form part of the discussion.
- 10. Create a section on "Managerial Implications" before the conclusion.
- 11. Merge both the conclusion and recommendations. Recommendations should be asterisked or presented in bullet points.
- 12. Include a section on Limitations and Areas of future research.

Qeios ID: CO75E3 · https://doi.org/10.32388/CO75E3