



Paper: “Incidence de la santé psychologique sur la culture de sécurité au travail : étude menée à MMG/Kinsevere/RDC”

Submitted: 02 May 2025

Accepted: 04 August 2025

Published: 31 August 2025

Corresponding Author: Johnny Kasongo Bwanga

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n23p87

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Boto Siméone Nasolo Raoël
École Normale Supérieure de Toamasina, Madagascar

Reviewer 2: Kepmegni Henriette
University de Yaoundé 1, Cameroon

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Kepmegni Henriette	
University/Country: University de Yaoundé 1	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Incidence de la santé psychologique sur la culture de sécurité au travail Etude menée à MMG/Kinsevere/RDC	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Informatif, accrocheur et pertinent. Il donne une idée claire du sujet de l'article tout en attirant l'attention du lecteur.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Informatif, concis, précis et rédigé dans un style clair et accessible.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Revoir le style de certaines phrases	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthodologie dans une enquête psychosociale englobe un ensemble de méthodes et de techniques visant à recueillir, analyser et interpréter des données relatives aux comportements, attitudes et interactions sociales des individus et des groupes. Elle implique la sélection d'une méthode appropriée, la définition d'un échantillon, le choix d'outils de collecte de données, et l'analyse des résultats en fonction de la question de recherché. Rien ne renseigne sur la sélection de la méthode d'enquête, la technique, la collecte des données: Échantillonnage. Quels tests psychologiques standardisés pour mesurer les aptitudes ou les connaissances	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Comment avez vous mesurer l estime de soi. Quels sont ses incateurs. Resultats clairs	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Répond à la problématique soulevée en introduction, et éventuellement ouvre sur de nouvelles perspectives	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Revoir toutes les citations dans le texte. Les references sont à refaires.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Revoir les citations dans le texte et dans les references selon APA. Etre explicite au niveau de la methodologie.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Dr. Boto Siméone Nasolo Raoël, PhD in Educational Psychology.	
University/Country: École Normale Supérieure de Toamasina, Madagascar.	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/07/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/07/2025
Manuscript Title: incidence sur la santé psychologique de la culture de sécurité au travail	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1	
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: 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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
(Please insert your comments)	
Non, le titre n'est pas approprié, moi je propose le titre suivant : La culture de sécurité : un	

pilier pour la santé psychologique au travail.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Veillez revoir les mots-clés.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Peu de pertinence dans la problematisation du sujet.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Résumé structuré</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Bibliographies appropriées</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):

1.Les mots-clés sont peu pertinents, peu explicites et plutôt baclés, moi je propose les mots suivants : santé psychologique -culture de sécurité -prévention des risques-résilience organisationnelle -gestion de conflits.

2.Veuillez apporter plus de précisions sur les points suivants:

- fournir plus d'informations sur l'impact de la culture de sécurité sur santé mentale des employés,**
- les meilleures pratiques pour promouvoir une bonne culture de sécurité au travail,**
- comment évaluer l'efficacité d'une culture de sécurité dans une organisation.**

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Cet article peut être publié sous réserve de ces dites corrections et suggestions .

Dans le cas contraire, il ne peut être mis à disposition de la revue scientifique par manque de pertinence dans les mots-clés et la problematisation du sujet.