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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editor-in-chief,
Greetings!
Hereby I am submitting my review report in regard to the manuscript PUBH-D-18-02236 entitled 'A randomised controlled trial of an educational intervention to promote safe behaviours in petrochemical workers: a study protocol'. This study topic of this protocol is relevant, given negligence of occupational safety concept in most developing countries. Globally, it is well written despite the presence of a number typos and issues related to syntax. Additionally, some questions and remarks that need authors' clarifications are provided in the following lines.

# Major points:
1- A paragraph containing the aim of the study is in the methods section; this location of the aim is not appropriate. It is not understandable why authors provide this aim as part of methods after describing the study objectives in previous sections.

2- In the methods, how authors will deal with ethical considerations such as matters related to consent to participate in the study are missing.

# Minor points:

Abstract
1- In the methods, second sentence seems incomplete; The study .... Mixed Methods Research carried out in two phases?

Background
1- The first paragraph should be revised, particularly sentences from line 15 to line 22. Some sentences are incomplete.

2- In the second paragraph, the first sentence should be revised; avoid redundancy (reformulate the sentence).

3- In the third paragraph, use 'occur in thousands of people' instead of 'face thousands of people.'.

4- Revise the sentence in line 47 - 48, by avoiding redundant terms (behaviour).
5- Line 50: the term 'risk of workplace' does not make sense in this sentence.

6- Page 3, Line 16: write '... it is also necessary to pay attention...'.

7- Page 4: The research question should be easy to understand, simple and feasible. It would be better to reformulate it in one

   main question in one sentence if possible, instead of writing a full paragraph.

8- There are too many objectives; these should be reformulated. Given that they study will planned to be implemented in 3 phases, each part/phase of the study

   could have at most 2 objectives.

9- Page 8: the interview questions should be clear and easily understandable; for he question related to occupational accident, it would be better to have a question

   regarding accident sustained by the respondent him/herself, and another one for accident occuring in co-workers.

10- Page 8: the last paragraph on this page contains what already appeared in the background section. Is it important to have it in the methods? Authors

   should have focused on the study population and sample.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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