

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 57278

Title: Rethinking the Effectiveness of Floor Markings, Machine Guards, and Safety Signage in Shaping Safer Work Environments.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: **ANAPANA GOPAL**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

General Comments

The manuscript addresses an important and practical issue in occupational safety—evaluating the effectiveness of floor markings, machine guards, and safety signage within a real industrial setting. The use of a qualitative embedded case study provides rich contextual insights, particularly highlighting practitioner-led innovation. The study is timely and relevant, especially in high-risk manufacturing environments. However, the manuscript is overly descriptive in many sections and lacks sufficient critical synthesis and theoretical depth in parts of the discussion. While the case study is strong, the generalizability and analytical rigor could be improved.

Content and Originality

The paper demonstrates moderate to high originality, particularly in:

- Developing new internal standards for exclusion zone markings
- Introducing pacemaker-specific safety interventions
- Emphasizing integration and interaction of multiple safety measures

The practitioner-led innovation aspect is a strong contribution. However:

- The novelty is somewhat context-bound (single organization: Diageo).
- Theoretical contribution could be strengthened by deeper engagement with existing safety models (e.g., socio-technical systems, resilience engineering).

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Technical Quality

The technical quality is adequate but not fully robust:

- The qualitative methodology is appropriate and well-justified.
- Use of triangulation (documents, observations, visual data) is commendable.
- Analytical methods (pattern matching, thematic analysis) are suitable.

Limitations:

- Lack of quantitative validation (e.g., accident rates, near-miss data).
- No clear explanation of:
 - Coding procedures
 - Inter-rater reliability (if applicable)
- Heavy reliance on observational and subjective interpretation

Overall, the study would benefit from mixed-method validation.

Language and Presentation

The manuscript requires significant language editing:

- Frequent grammatical issues (e.g., sentence structure, tense inconsistency)
- Repetition of phrases and ideas
- Some awkward or unclear expressions

Examples:

- "This paper addressed these limitations..." → should be *addresses*
- Long sentences reduce readability

Positives:

- Terminology is appropriate
- Technical vocabulary is used correctly

Recommendation: Professional proofreading is strongly needed

Structure and Organization

The structure follows a standard research format and is generally logical:

- Abstract → Introduction → Literature Review → Methodology → Results → Discussion → Conclusion

Strengths:

- Clear sectioning
- Comprehensive literature review

Issues:

- Some sections are overly lengthy (especially Literature Review and Results)
- Redundancy between:
 - Results and Discussion
 - Introduction and Literature Review
- Figures are referenced but not analytically integrated (more descriptive than interpretive)

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

References and Citations

The reference list is extensive and up-to-date, including recent studies (2024–2025), which is a strong point.

Concerns:

- Some duplicate references (e.g., [20] repeated)
- Occasional weak alignment between citations and claims
- Over-reliance on secondary or general studies rather than highly focused empirical work

Formatting appears mostly consistent but should be checked for journal compliance.

Overall Recommendation

The paper has strong practical relevance and moderate theoretical contribution, but requires minor revisions before it can be considered for publication.

Key improvements needed:

- Strengthen analytical depth and theoretical integration
- Improve language and readability
- Reduce redundancy and improve conciseness
- Add quantitative or longitudinal evidence (if possible)
- Clarify methodological rigor (coding, validation)

Final Decision:

Minor Revision Required