



Paper: “An Assessment of School Going Population Exposure Pathways to Agropesticide in the Mungo Corridor of Cameroon”

Corresponding Author: Ernest Nkemleke

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n25p123

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Iamze Taboridze
David Aghmashenebeli University of Georgia, Georgia

Reviewer 2: John B. Strait
Sam Houston State University, USA

Published: 30.09.2020

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: John Strait	
University/Country: United States	
Date Manuscript Received: 8/19/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 8/23/2020
Manuscript Title: An Assessment of School Going Population Exposure Pathways to Agropesticide in the Mungo Corridor of Cameroon	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 98.08.2020	
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 YES	
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.

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

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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): I find this to be a very well organized, and very well written paper. Great job. It will make a solid contribution to the literature and to the ESJ

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Iamze Taboridze	
University/Country: David Aghmashenebeli University of Georgia/Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 17.08.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 19.08.2020
Manuscript Title: An Assessment of School Going Population Exposure Pathways to Agropesticide in the Mungo Corridor of Cameroon	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0898/20	
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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The manuscript also represents the consequences of exposure to pesticides, which are not shown in the title.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract is not structured</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are a small number of grammatical errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Statistical formulas are not required, the methods and statistical criteria used and indicate the source in the references; Indicate, what is the maximum distance considered to be close to school and residence considering the climate?	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
The data given in the table should not be repeated in the text, it is enough to mention whether there is a reliable difference between the groups, according to which indicator and in which group the frequency, or the average number is reliably higher, or according to which characteristic there is no reliable difference. Used statistical methods are also indicated in the results section; instead they should be only in the material and methods. It is unnecessary in the text to explain what the null hypothesis is. The tables are overloaded, for quantitative indicators indicate average and standard Deviation, for qualitative indicators - quantity and frequency, for comparison - statistical criteria and p. The incidence of illness and symptoms should preferably be compared to the incidence of students who are not exposed to pesticides or, if this is not possible, the incidence of populations in the same age group.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusion is similar to the results; distinguish 2-3 specific conclusions.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>There are several old sources in the references</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article is interesting and relevant, it is recommended for publication after corrections.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: