

Paper: “Réactivité des Employés face à la Culture de Sécurité du Travail dans l'Entreprise Minerals and Metals Group/Kinsevere RDC”

Submitted: 05 August 2024

Accepted: 08 October 2024

Published: 31 October 2024

Corresponding Author: Johnny Kasongo Bwanga

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n28p186](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n28p186)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mballo Ibrahima
UCAD, Sénégal

Reviewer 2: Diboh Emmanuel
Université Jean LOROUGNON GUEDE (Daloa-Côte d'Ivoire)

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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: Ibrahima MBALLO	
University/Country: UCAD – Sénégal	
Date Manuscript Received: 05//09/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/09/2024
Manuscript Title: Réactivité des employés face à la culture de la sécurité du travail dans l'entreprise Minerals and Metals Group /Kinsevere, RDC	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0849/24	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is not precise enough for a good understanding of the content.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The elements of the abstract need to be completed and clearly highlight the results of the article	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, there are grammatical errors and mistakes to correct	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The methodology has shortcomings that need to be corrected	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The results must be presented clearly, without discussion	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
It's too long and unstructured with elaborations	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>References must be developed with scientific articles and numbered; respect journal standards.</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):

Take all comments into consideration. Revise the introduction, methodology and conclusion. Correctly present the sections, especially the results, according to journal standards.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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 GUEDE (Daloa-Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 18/07/2024
Manuscript Title: REACTIVITE DES EMPLOYES FACE A LA CULTURE DE SECURITE DU TRAVAIL DANS L'ENTREPRISE MINERALS AND METALS GROUP /KINSEVERE, RDC	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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: 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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

<i>Ce manuscrit comporte un nombre raisonnable de fautes de grammaire et d'orthographe</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<p><i>La méthodologie n'est pas claire. On a aucune idée des questionnaires constitutives de l'enquête. Aussi, l'auteur indique que l'étude s'est déroulée sur 6 ans (2015-2021). Je comprend mal une telle durée pour ce genre d'étude (enquête).</i></p> <p>Il aurait été plus intéressant de faire une étude comparative sur la sécurité dans le secteur minier par exemple incluant plusieurs entreprises. Le faite de cette étude soit faite sur la seule entreprise nous prive de reference et parait comme de la publicité faite) cette entreprise.</p> <p>L'introduction fait 7 pages. Elle est incompréhensible, mal structurer, avec une problématique mal posée.</p> <p>Il y a des tirets dans tout le document.</p> <p>La discussion comporte de sous-tire.</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
<i>Les résultats sont nettement insuffisants. les analyses statistiques ne sont pas énoncées dans la méthodologie. Il y a absence d'écart-types sur le graphique.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1.5
<i>La conclusion n'est pas consise on y perd de vu l'essentiel à retenir. Elle fait plus de deux pages. Une 1/2 page serait suffisante Aussi les perspectives sont tune invitations aux autres chercheurs de poursuivre la présente étude</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1.5
<i>Les références ne sont pas récentes et sont souvent mal citées. Exemple; Hale, (2000, p.1-14) Wiegmann, D., et Wilson, L. D,(2007, p.54)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: