



Paper: “Perception de la culture de sécurité dans les entreprises du secteur minier à Lubumbashi”

Submitted: 02 May 2025

Accepted: 06 August 2025

Published: 30 September 2025

Corresponding Author: Johnny Kasongo Bwanga

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n26p84

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Diboh Emmanuel

Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé de Daloa, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: DIBOH Emmanuel	
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé de Daloa / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/07/25	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Perception de la culture de sécurité dans les entreprises du secteur minier à Lubumbashi	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0537/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: OUI	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: OUI	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: OUI	

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.	3,5
<i>Dans le titre du manuscrit, le mot "les" me paraît inapproprié puisque l'étude n'a porté que sur deux entreprises du secteur minier.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Le résumé ne doit pas contenir de citation. Exemple: Kimber Meyer, Léonie Guguen, Walton Pantland, (2019))</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2,5
<i>(Le nombre de fautes grammaticales est relativement élevé. Certaines suggestions ont été faite dans le document qui accompagne ce rapport)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Méthodologie assez explicite)</i>	

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3,5
<i>(Les résultats sont acceptables. Cependant, il y a peu de test statistique indiquant la significativité des résultats comparatifs)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(les références sont acceptables car relativement recentes)</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):

Prendre le temps de faire lire les manuscrit par d'autres personnes avant soumission afin de réduire le nombre de coquilles. En outre, le chapitre des discussions est confondu à celui des résultats.