

Your review report

Manuscript

A comprehensive risk assessment method for hot work in underground mines based on G1-EWM and unascertained measure theory

Feedback for the author(s)

Comments to the author(s)

REVIEW OF THE ARTICLE

The underground mining is an extremely complex job, with many potential unsafe risks. The issue of safety at underground mines is not only of concern to managers and direct operators, but it is also of concern to mining researchers. Therefore, it is necessary to research risk assessment methods in underground mining, from which a suitable method can be found to apply to a specific mine in practice. In this article, the authors used a risk assessment method for hot work based on G1-EWM and unascertained measurement theory was proposed to prevent hot work accidents in underground mines. The reviewer said that the authors could consider some of the following comments:

1. The article is completely technically sound. Based on the identification of indicators related to the research problem, the authors have developed steps, established a model and method for assessing the risks of underground mining activities. Since then, the model has been applied to an underground mine in actual production.
2. The statistical analysis of the data in the article is completely reasonable. The authors analyzed the data and analyzed input information to establish the model.
3. The analysis results and practical applications of the research are consistent with the research method proposed by the authors.
4. In the article, the authors have provided indicators and risk assessment levels (in table 2), is this valid? Can the author explain this issue?
5. References are appropriate to the research problem in the article.

Confidential feedback for the Editor

Your recommendation

- **Accept**
-

Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question (including the use of appropriate controls), and are the conclusions supported by the evidence presented?

- **Yes**
-

Are the methods sufficiently described to allow the study to be repeated?

- **Yes**
-

Is the use of statistics and treatment of uncertainties appropriate?

- **Yes**
-

Is the presentation of the work clear?

- **Yes**
-

Are the images in this manuscript (including electrophoretic gels and blots) free from apparent manipulation?

- **Yes**
-

Confidential comments to the Editor

According to the reviewer, the article completely meets the quality requirements and is published in this journal.

Reviewer's opinion: The paper can be accepted