

**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	

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p>ORIGINALITY: (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Does the paper clearly point out differences from related research? Yes</li><li>- Are the problems or approaches new? yes</li></ul> <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"><li>- Is the work important? yes</li><li>- Does it advance the state of the art? yes</li><li>- Does the paper stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view? yes</li></ul> <p>TECHNICAL QUALITY (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Is the paper technically sound, with compelling arguments?</li><li>- Is there a careful evaluation? Does the paper carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contributions? yes</li><li>- Does the paper offer a new form of evidence in support of or against a well known technique?</li><li>- 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</li></ul> <p>QUALITY OF PRESENTATION (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Is the paper clearly written? yes</li><li>- Does the paper motivate the research? yes</li><li>- Are results clearly described and evaluated? yes</li><li>- Is the paper well organized? yes</li></ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	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	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yousef Farhaoui
Department, University & Country	Moulay Ismail University, Morocco