Corresponding Author: Fabrice Etoundi Bala

Reviewer E:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title of article should be more specific.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Abstract is very good, clearly presents all.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

no

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

yes

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

In the background of the study authors wrote very good about topics important for the article, but I don´t know why the wrote about risk taking. Also some of the references are too old.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Some of them are too old.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Authors of the article made very good work, but I think it would be necessary to split up participant - because of age - there is problem compare 14 years old and 24 years old. also participants should match to statistic of people they are using taboco.

Reviewer I:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is very clear and precise.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is excellent. Clearly present all the elements.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The text is very well written. There are just some mistakes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The method is described clearly and in detail.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The text is very well written.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The discussion recovers the literature presented in the state of the art and the approaches it makes are consistent with the text.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

References are appropriate, but some authors mentioned in the text are not in the reference list.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Write down all the references, according to the authors who are cited in the text.