Manuscript: "**Profil Épidémiologique Des Pathologies Respiratoires Aux Services De Pneumologie De La Ville De Meknès (Maroc)"**

Corresponding author: Ibrahim El Ghazi

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jean de Dieu Mangambu

Reviewer 2: Adou Bini Y. Christophe",
CNRA (Côte d'Ivoire)

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: Mangambu Mokoso	
University/Country:RDC	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Profil épidémiologique des pathologies respiratoires aux services de pneumologie de la ville de Meknès (Maroc)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u>/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Ye**s/No You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u>/No	

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.	**4/5**
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3,75/5**

(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4,75/5**
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4/5**
(Please insert your comments)	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4,5/5**
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3/5**
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4/5**
(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):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

Mettre les références dans le texte sera mieux et ajoute des sous titres dans la discussion.

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

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: ADOU Bini Yao Christophe	Email:
University/Country: CNRA (Côte d'Ivoire)	

Date Manuscript Received: 13-10-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 22-10-2020

ManuscriptTitle: **Profil épidémiologique des pathologies respiratoires aux services de pneumologie de la ville de Meknès (Maroc)**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: **97.10.2020**	
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**
Pour le titre en Anglais, sauf les déterminants et les prépositions ne doivent pas commencer par une lettre majuscule	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
La partie conclusion de ce résumé est dominée par une perspective. Ce qui est	

d'ailleurs inutile.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**2**
Dans les commentaires des résultats, c'est le passé compose qui doitêtreutilisé. Dans la discussion, c'est le présent de l'indicatif qui doit être beaucoup utilisé	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**2**
• L'introduction n'est qu'une simple juxtaposition des informations. Mettez des connexions logiques entre elles ; • Au niveau des nombres, les chiffres sont mélangés aux lettres ; • On ne voit pas en quoi les valeurs ont été statistiquement analysées. Il n'y a pas eu de test de différentiation des moyennes ; • Les nombres sont beaucoup trop écrits en lettre ; • Que signifie les acronymes « DDB » ?	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**2**
Résumé plus volumineuxquel'introduction	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**2**
Perspective exposée en lieu et place de la conclusion	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**2**
Mal conçue	

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):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1)   Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

À fournir encore d'effort en vous référant aux remarques et recommandations consignées dans le tableau.

(2)   Changes which must be made before publication
                    Tous mes encouragements pour la suite.