

Manuscript: “**Social Representations Of Diseases Linked To Climate Change In The Population Of A Slum District: A Case Study From Haiti**”

Submitted: 06 April 2021

Accepted: 11 May 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Evens Emmanuel

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n15p262

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Judith Exantus, Universite d’Etat d’Haiti

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Raúl Rocha Romero, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Judith Exantus	
University/Country: Universite d'Etat d'Haiti	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/16/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/23/2021
Manuscript Title: SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS OF DISEASES LINKED TO CLIMATE CHANGE IN POPULATIONS OF A SLUM: CASE STUDY FROM HAITI	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0461/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes Yes/No	
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	

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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is clear and tells about the study : purpose and population	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The authors present very well in the abstract the methods, the objects and the results. But I suggest to review the organization of the abstract. Regarding to this : .. This work highlights the link established by the population of Jalousie respectively</i>	

to the 'Public Hygiene and supernatural phenomena..... I think the authors should close the abstract with this phrase.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>I found some tiny errors and spelling mistakes. The terms not familiar in English translated or used in the context of your paper from another language should be in italics.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The methods are clearly explained. However there are some tiny points: We recommend to the authors to not use personal pronouns all along the document. Correct bi-variate analyses instead of bi-variate crosses in the “Population survey”. The right spelling is orthophotoplan (line 4 first paragraph of Methods Also the 2 figures (1 and 2) should be referenced.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Please review the structure of this section. It is better to have Results Section and Discussion Section. It seems there is an error in the numbering of the figures. We found Fig 1 and Fig 2 in Methods section. And again fig 1 and 2 in the Results section. Thanks to review that. In First line put “years” after 65 please The study population with 52% originating from the Ouest department (Figure 3) and 63% residents of the metropolitan area of Port-au-Prince. Do the authors mean that 63 % of the residents (pulled from the 52% living in the West Department)?? For the last paragraph of socio-demographic: Avoid to start any phrase all long the document with a number. Also write the absolute value befor and percentage in parenthesis. Put a “ :” after secondary school. This paragraph is a little confusing	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusions are accurate and related to the study, to the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Review the references list according to the guidelines of the ESJ. Did you use APA style?	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The study is original and pertinent to the environment context of Haiti.
Some revision are necessary in terms of phrases structure, organization of the document and numbering of figures /tables.
It would be good if the revised version could be read by an English-speaking



ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 16 th April, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 21-24 April, 2020
Manuscript Title: Social representations of diseases linked to climate change in populations of a slum: case study from Haiti	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ISSN 1857-7881 e-1857-7431	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
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	

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.	3
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The title is clear and unambiguous. It clearly communicates the intent of the researchers but not very adequate to the content of the article.</p>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The authors over emphasized on the introduction and very little or nothing at all on methodology, results and conclusions/recommendations. The abstract should clearly summarize the introduction, methods used, results and conclusions/recommendations.</p>	
3. There are very few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Grammatical errors are not wide spread.</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Authors have not clearly explained the methodology. Under the heading “The population survey” authors indicated clearly that they adopted “the qualitative, exploratory and descriptive study type” but presented only quantitative results. The authors did not also indicate the study design used. Inclusion and exclusion criteria were clearly explained. How the study setting was organized into blocks was not clearly stated. Sampling of households and participants were not clearly indicated. The statistical instrument for the data analysis was not mentioned and no information on ethical clearance.</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The only socio-demographic information presented was age and most of the graphs were not properly described. The results presented as bivariate analysis is totally misleading and does not even represent bivariate analysis. The results presented does not adequately answer the research question or meet the objectives of the study.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	0
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The authors presented what I will describe as a discussion of their results as</p>	

conclusion. In effect the study has no conclusion.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The references are somewhat comprehensive but not appropriate. The list of references has not been arranged in any order (descending or ascending) as I presumed the authors used the APA referencing style. Intext reference like “Corvington, 2007” could not also be found in the list of references.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The topic is a very interesting one and very relevant especially in this era of rapid climate change and its implications on the health of the most vulnerable. The authors did a very good job in the review of literature but lost their way in designing study methodology and hence the inadequate results which could not meet the research objectives. This led to a bizarre conclusion. I however encourage authors to redesign the methodology and modify the data collection tools.



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: Raúl Rocha Romero	
University/Country: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. México	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/04/2021
Manuscript Title: SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS OF DISEASES LINKED TO CLIMATE CHANGE IN POPULATIONS OF A SLUM: CASE STUDY FROM HAITI	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 61.04.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
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	

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.	5
<i>The title, although long, is clear since it incorporates the study variables and the sample.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract is very specific about what is incorporated in the article.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are some grammatical mistakes that need to be corrected.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The methodological section is well explained and is very specific.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are presented in a very clear and descriptive way.</i>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are well presented, they take up the theoretical part developed before and specify the limitations of the study.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>There are several references that are not cited in the text and vice versa.</i>	

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):

Correct the grammar, there are several mistakes. Also correct the references.