



Paper: “**Analyse des effets de la sédentarité professionnelle liée au travail sur écran dans une industrie alimentaire du Mali**”

Submitted: 11 December 2025

Accepted: 28 January 2026

Published: 31 January 2026

Corresponding Author: Bocar Baila Diedhiou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n3p61

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Emoud Tcholi Idrissa

Service de surveillance épidémiologique et recherche, Hôpital Général de Référence, Niger
Laboratoire de microbiologie tropicale, Université Abdou Moumouni, Niger

Reviewer 2: 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: EMOUD TCHOLI Idrissa	
University/Country: NIGER	
Date Manuscript Received: 19/12/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/12/2025
Manuscript Title: Analyse des effets de la séentarité professionnelle liée au travail sur écran dans une industrie alimentaire du Mali	
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:	
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. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	5
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>The abstract clearly presents the objectives, methods, and main results of the study. However, some elements could be slightly more concise</i>	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>There are a few grammatical and spelling errors throughout the manuscript that should be corrected to improve clarity and readability.</i>	3

« Le lien est considéré significatif si p inférieur à 0,05 »

Correction :

→ *Le lien est considéré significatif si p est inférieur à 0,05*

« P- value significatif » (Tableau 3)

double erreur (langue + accord)

Correction :

→ *p-value significative*

ou

→ *Statistically significant p-value*

Utilisation alternée de :

- *TA / pression artérielle*
- *IMC élevé / IMC anormalement élevé*
- **Recommandation :** harmoniser la terminologie dans tout l'article.

« Il s'agissait d'une étude descriptive et prospective »

formulation ambiguë (plutôt méthodologique que grammaticale, mais à signaler)

Correction suggérée :

→ *Il s'agissait d'une étude descriptive transversale à visée analytique*

« Les agents exécutants (AE) étaient plus représentés (cfr tableau 1). »

Correction :

→ *(cf. Tableau 1)*

Espaces manquants ou en trop :

- $kg/m2 \rightarrow kg/m^2$
- $p<0,05 \rightarrow p < 0.05$ (cohérence avec l'anglais)

Anglais (abstract)

- « *Analysis of the effects of sedentary work related to screen use* »
correct, mais lourd
suggestion stylistique :
→ *Analysis of the health effects of screen-related sedentary work*

4. The study methods are explained clearly.

4

(Please insert your comments)

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.

4

The results are generally clearly presented and easy to understand. Tables and figures support the text well. However, some minor inconsistencies and presentation issues were noted (e.g., p-value notation, n (%) not always clearly indicated in tables) that should be corrected.

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.

4

(Please insert your comments)

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

4

(Please insert your comments)

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed

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):

- The manuscript addresses a relevant topic and provides valuable data for occupational health research in Mali.
- Minor revisions are needed to improve clarity, grammar, and methodological explanations.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

- The manuscript addresses a relevant and under-researched topic in the context of occupational health in Mali.
- The study is generally well conducted, and the results are meaningful and supported by the data.
- Minor issues related to language, formatting, and methodological clarity (e.g., study design, justification of the 5-hour sedentary threshold, lack of adjustment for confounders) need to be addressed.
- Overall, the manuscript is suitable for publication after minor revision.
- Recommendation: **Accept with minor revisions.**