

Manuscript: “**Effects Of Environmental Factors And Atmospheric Pollution in the Incidence of Hospital Admissions of Patients With Stroke In São Paulo City By Stroke In São Paulo City**”

Submitted: 27 November 2021

Accepted: 04 March 2022

Published: 31 March 2022

Corresponding Author: **André Akira**

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n11p157

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Fernando Rocha

Reviewer 2: Dance Vasileva

Reviewer 3: Thais Massetti, Universidade de São Paulo – USP / Brazil

Reviewer 4: Kazeem Olanrewaju, Prairie View A & M University, United States of America

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: 11/02/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/02/2022
Manuscript Title: EFFECTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS AND ATMOSPHERIC POLLUTION IN THE INCIDENCE OF HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS BY STROKE IN SÃO PAULO CITY	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 42.12.2021	
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	
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.	5
<i>The title is appropriate, presenting the topic in a clear and objective</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The objective is clear, the method described corresponds to the objective of the</i>	

<i>research and the results are presented properly</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>Adequate</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The method described is appropriate to achieve the research objective, moreover, it is clear and complete.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Adequate</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The summary is presented clearly. The conclusion adequately responds to the proposed objective</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Adequate</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 did not identify the limitation of hospitalization data. However, this does not diminish the importance of the results. I suggest the author implement the limitations of hospitalization data
 Check the translation of table captions

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I believe that ecological studies are important for the identification and creation of hypotheses that help to improve health actions.

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: 11.02.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 13.02.2022
Manuscript Title: Effects of environmental factors and atmospheric pollution in the incidence of hospital admissions by stroke in São Paulo city	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1242/21	
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>no comment</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>no comment</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>no comment</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>no comment</i>	

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>no comment</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>no comment</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>no comment</i>	

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):

no comment

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

no comment

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: Thais Massetti	
University/Country: Universidade de São Paulo – USP / Brazil	

Date Manuscript Received: 02/22/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: EFFECTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS AND ATMOSPHERIC POLLUTION IN THE INCIDENCE OF HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS BY STROKE IN SÃO PAULO CITY	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1242/21	
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.	5
<i>suitable topic</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>suitable topic</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>I don't see the need for a new grammar review</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>suitable topic</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>suitable topic</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>suitable topic</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4

observe if it would not be possible to add 2 to 4 more recent references, last 3 years

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I consider the topic relevant, and necessary for the scientific community, I suggest publication, I remain at your disposal.

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: Kazeem Olanrewaju	
University/Country: Prairie View A & M University, United States of America	
Date Manuscript Received: 2/22/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 3/1/2022
Manuscript Title: EFFECTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS AND ATMOSPHERIC POLLUTION IN THE INCIDENCE OF HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS BY STROKE IN SÃO PAULO CITY	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

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
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>I am suggesting a slight modification to the title. This modification can be thus “EFFECTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS AND ATMOSPHERIC POLLUTION IN THE INCIDENCE OF HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS OF PATIENTS WITH STROKE IN SÃO PAULO CITY”</p>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>I have made substantial amount of comments on the grammatical errors. The comments are on the Paper</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Yes</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>It will add to the strength of the paper, if exposure limit to this pollutant are also discussed</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	

A statement need to be rephrase in the conclusion for clarity	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Enough references were cited. The references need to be properly arrange.</i> <i>Reference citation tool can be of help</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):

The strength of this paper will be further enhanced if exposure limit of these pollutants can also be discussed