

Manuscript: “**Perceptions sur les Conduites Dopantes dans le Sport dans la Ville de Bobo-Dioulasso (Burkina Faso)**”

Submitted: 08 October 2021

Accepted: 26 December 2021

Published: 31 January 2022

Corresponding Author: Guenne Samson

Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n3p262

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Prof Georges Kpazaï,Canada

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Perceptions sur les conduites dopantes dans le sport dans la ville de Bobo-Dioulasso (Burkina Faso)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: 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>Yes for sure. The title is very catchy</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	5

results.	
<i>Yes. All the aspects are there.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The French used is very good.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Quite clearly explained yes. Large study. With important relevance in the field. The is no exclusion criteria.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Results section is very clear and interesting to read.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Conclusions are ok, with clear/main procentual results beeing presented</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Yes</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):

None

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: Prof Georges Kpazai, Ph.D.	Email:
University/Country: Canada	
Date Manuscript Received: November 9, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: December 2, 2021
Manuscript Title: Perceptions sur les conduites dopantes dans le sport dans la ville de Bobo-Dioulasso (Burkina Faso)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1066/21 or 66.10.2021	
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/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>Clear and Adequate to the content of manuscript</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>See my thoughts in the text.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>no</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>yes</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>See my comments and suggestions to the authors</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>yes</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Yes the references are appropriate. But not written, most of the time, as APA's recommendations (6th or 7th version). Be sure that all the references in the bibliography have to follow this rule.</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):

Your manuscript is very well written. Easy to read and understand your scientific approach. Well done!

However, I still wonder about the purpose of your paper. In the abstract of your article you underline that the objective is to evaluate the CAPs of players.

In the methodological part, you say that your research is a descriptive one. And in the discussion of your results, you lukewarmly discuss the results found in the sense that it is difficult to perceive the evaluative dimension of your investigation. This leaves me perplexed and I ask you to review the discussion in this sense (that of an evaluation) of the corpus collected.

Moreover, all references should be written according to the writing standards of the 6th or 7th edition

of APA.
Thank you.