



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Field-Based Environmental Vigilance Profiles Associated with Rural Activities in the Pool Department, Republic of the Congo”

Submitted: 12 June 2026

Accepted: 28 July 2026

Published: 31 August 2026

Corresponding Author: Ifo Suspense Averti

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n23p91

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Barthelemy Honfoga
University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: Prof. Barthelemy HONFOGA	
University, Country: University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 13 July 2026
Manuscript Title: Socio-Environmental Risk Profiles Associated with Rural Activities in the Localities of the Pool Department, Republic of the Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 29	
You agree that 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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
-----------	---

1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	4
<i>Considering the restriction/limitation of not getting people's assessment of perceived risks, can "Socio-" still hold in the title?</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
<i>The abstract is clear and well structured.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>None</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The source of the study database was not mentioned. From whom were the responses in the tables obtained? The study claims some originality, but one limitation of the study is that you did not use any physical measurement of risk assessment to evaluate the risk level of the various localities. The field-based environmental variables remained based on your observation/perception, therefore subjective and probably biased. You should find some way to say there is this limitation.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>It is not clear which social data were used in the study. The four main vigilance profiles are not obvious from table 4. The risk typology, with 4 main features, does not appear clearly. Revise the latter accordingly or build a separate table. The potential risk level should be also mentioned.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>Yes, but social data referred to in the title and the database were missing in the analysis. Were did you obtain responses from?</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Not enough. References from Central Africa were quite little.</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):