

Paper: “Pollution de l’air et comportement à risque des employés de boulangerie à Abidjan (Côte d’Ivoire)”

Submitted: 01 May 2022

Accepted: 26 July 2022

Published: 31 July 2022

Corresponding Author: Konan Loukou Leandre

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n24p90

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Stéphane Zingué
University of Yaoundé 1, Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Babio Sanni
University Of Parakou, Benin

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Bouzid Mohammed
Université M'Hamed Bougara, Cite Frantz Fanon, Boumerdes, Algérie

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Stéphane Zingué	
University/Country: University of Yaoundé 1	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/05/2022
Manuscript Title: Pollution de l'air et comportement à risque des employés de boulangerie à Abidjan (Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The Title is Ok	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Must be rewritten	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Well written, a little typos	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Good	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Results are Ok	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Absence of recommendation in Conclusion	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Must be double-checked	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please find enclosed my comments directly in your MS.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: BABIO	
University/Country: University of Parakou (BENIN)	
Date Manuscript Received: 19/05/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/05/2022
Manuscript Title: Pollution de l'air et comportement à risque des employés de boulangerie à Abidjan (Côte d'Ivoire)/ Air pollution and risky behaviour of bakery workers in Abidjan (Cote d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0828/22	
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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The study environment is not specified in the abstract</i> <i>The number of bakeries is not given</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Methodology lacks consistency Lack of overall statistical analysis The information of the individual characteristics of bakers is lacking	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Results lack important details	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> insufficiency	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>No, the references are not complete..</i> <i>Some authors mentioned in the article do not appear in the references</i>	

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):

Dans l'ensemble l'article comporte des insuffisances qu'il faut corriger pour lui donner son caractère scientifique.

Le milieu d'étude et le nombre de boulangeries à préciser dans le résumé

La formulation de certaines phrases à revoir dans l'introduction

La méthodologie n'a prévu aucune analyse statistique. Or des tests de comparaisons sont nécessaires ici pour comparer les boulangeries.

Les caractéristiques individuelles des boulangers (âge, situation matrimoniale, antécédants médicaux ...)

Il y a d'autres infections respiratoires en dehors de l'asthme

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

There are many shortcomings in the methodology. The author must better clarify his approach and carry out comparison tests between bakeries

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: 19 05 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 22 05 2022
Manuscript Title: Pollution de l'air et comportement à risque des employés de boulangerie à Abidjan (Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 28.05.2022	
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: No	
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>CE TEXTE EST DOTE D'UN INTITULE CLAIR ET PRECIS</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>NOUS NOTONS UN BON DESCRIPTIF DES OBJECTIFS DE LA METHODE ET DES RESULTATS</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>LE NIVEAU DE LANGUE ET LE STYLE D'ECRIURE SONT CORRECTES</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(LAMETHODOLOGIE DEPLOYEE EST LISIBLE ET CLAIREMENT DEFINIE. LES PROCEDURES SONT CONFORMES A LA PRATIQUE EN SCIENCES SOCIALES. LES PROCEDURES QUANTITAIRES SONT SIMPLES ET ACCESSIBLES.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>NOUS NOTONS UNE BONNE PRESENTATION DES RESULTATS</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(LA CONCLUSION ET LE RESUME SONT EN ADEQUATION AVEC LE CONTENU DU TEXTE</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>LES REFERENCES CITEES SONT EN ADEQUATION AVEC LE SUJET TRAITÉ</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

JUSTE DE CORRECTIONS RELATIVES A DES COQUILLES ET A DES MISES EN FORME EN ITALIQUE.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: CE TEXTE EST PUBLIABLE

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Bouzid Mohammed	
University/Country: Algérie	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Pollution de l'air et comportement à risque des employés de boulangerie à Abidjan (Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	5

<i>Oui le titre est Claire et en accord avec le sujet traité)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Oui, le résumé est Claire et objectif)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Quelques expressions ratées)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>L'approche est scientifique. Elle se base sur une enquette du terrain. C'est une etude de terrain. Abidjan est une ville importante en Afrique, les resultants sont important pour nous.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(La problématique est Claire, le résultat de meme.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Oui la conclusion comme le résumé sont bon)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Les references sont adaptées et pertinentes)</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):

C'est une problématique pertinente et d'actualité. Vous êtes dans votre rôle comme acteur en sciences médicales. L'approche scientifique est bonne. Elle se base sur une étude sur terrain. Votre conclusion est instructive.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: