

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_111521
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of air pollution from the Libreville landfill on children aged 3 to 11 years. Comparative study of children living in the vicinity versus children living far.
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>ORIGINALITY: (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Does the paper clearly point out differences from related research? Yes- Are the problems or approaches new? yes <p>For example, does the paper: address a new problem or one that has not been studied in much depth? yes</p> <p>introduce an interesting research paradigm? yes</p> <p>introduce an area that appears promising, or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives? yes</p> <p>SIGNIFICANCE (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Is the work important? yes- Does it advance the state of the art? yes- Does the paper stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view? yes <p>TECHNICAL QUALITY (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Is the paper technically sound, with compelling arguments?- Is there a careful evaluation? Does the paper carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contributions? yes- Does the paper offer a new form of evidence in support of or against a well known technique?- If the paper describes an application, is there: a clear and compelling motivation for why the chosen approach is important? a careful description of the design and implementation of the system? a thorough evaluation of the system with respect to a clearly-stated set of functional and quality requirements? yes <p>QUALITY OF PRESENTATION (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Is the paper clearly written? yes- Does the paper motivate the research? yes- Are results clearly described and evaluated? yes- Is the paper well organized? yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I have some recommendations and remarks: 1- What interests your work, 2- Try to show more experiences results for each topic 3- Use and study other recent methods. 4. if it is possible to add a section where you cite related works and give background information	Since Dandora Study, ther is no more studies in Africa on dumpsite. Most of the studies are from developped countries. So there are few possibilities with no budget to conduct such enquiries.
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	