

**Peer Review Comments: Presentation on Health Risk Rating Tool**

<b>Success Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Does this represent effective HS&E practice or can you see major technical flaws?	I think it is acceptable, although it is not my favorite example of this sort of tool.
How suitable is this tool for use by a small or medium enterprise? (assume they can hire a professional resource if necessary)	Small or medium enterprises could use this tool as effectively as larger enterprises.
How relevant do you think this tool is to nanotechnology? (some of the tools have been adapted from other issues e.g. handling respiratory allergens – in these situations do you feel it may be non or poorly applicable to nano?)	To use this tool effectively for nanomaterials, we would have to make the assumption that where there are large particles, there are also nanoparticles. This is probably true and therefore the tool would be applicable.
Is there anything that could be added to this tool to make it more effective?	I think an improvement to the tool would be to concentrate on the first criterion (amount of exposure), include the second (number of events), and eliminate the last two (number of people exposed and ability to get to respirator).
Please supply a short (3-5 sentence) summary that we may post with the tool on the compendium. Indicate what the tool delivers, how effective you think it is and any major limitations.	The reason that I have some misgivings about this tool: 1) The rating for numbers of people exposed seems arbitrary (1, 2, 3, >3). I would give the same risk to one person exposed as to >3. 2) The rating cutpoints for “ability to get to respirator on time” also seem arbitrary, although valid.