Paper: "**An Assessment Of The AFL Mask® And LUNA Wallmount, The New Developments In The AirPurifier Industry For Preventing The Airborne Pathogens**"

Corresponding Author: Arun Ghosh

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Bouzid,M'Hamed Bougara , Boumerdes, Algéria

Reviewer 2: Rania Zayed, Cairo University, Egypt

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Bouzid	Email:
University/Country: M'Hamed Bougara , Boumerdes, Algéria	
Date Manuscript Received: 12 08 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 15 08 2020
Manuscript Title: **An Assessment of the AFL Mask®and LUNA Wallmount, the new developments in the Air-Purifier industry for preventing the airborne pathogens**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0779/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:Yes/No You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
The title is indicative of the work done in the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	**5**

results.	
Yes Claire, simple and precise, happy to read this abstract: straight to the point	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
Negligible	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
The method followed is fundamentally clear and applied	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**5**
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors, yes	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
Les conclusions ou le résumé sont précis et étayés par le contenu.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
Les références sont complètes et appropriées. To study well	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation)：

Accepted, no revision needed	**X**
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
It is desirable to add the DOI, ISBN or ISSN for each article in the references
Comments and Suggestions to the Editors:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Rania Zayed	Email: raniaa_zayed@yahoo.com
University/Country: Cairo University/Egypt	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/08/2020
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: An Assessment of the AFL Mask® and LUNA Wallmount, the new developments in the Air-Purifier industry for preventing the airborne pathogens	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: **Yes**	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Yes** You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Yes**	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
(Please insert your comments)	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
In the introduction, the second paragraph is a repetition of the last part of the first paragraph.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
(Please insert your comments)	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
(Please insert your comments)	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
(Please insert your comments)	

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
(Please insert your comments)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)：

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please revise and correct figures numbering and referral in text.
In fig1 Explain types of masks in figure legend
In fig 2 Revise stages description
Fig 7 is missing
In fig 8 add description for 8F
There is no discussion in the manuscript, only results are displayed

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: