SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_46739**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Perceived effects of charcoal production on the health status of rural dwellers in Rainforest and Guinea Savannah Agro-ecological zones of Nigeria**
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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	**No**	
Minor REVISION comments	In 3:00: Producción anual de los encuestados de la producción de carbón vegetal: Indicate that the coal production data come from verbal information, therefore may have biases that the reader should consider. In Methods: Indicate the ethical aspect considered in the study. If there was informed consent and approval of the study by an ethics committee In Conclusion and Recommendations: The conclusions and recommendations should reflect what was considered objective: Evaluate the perceived health effects of charcoal production; in fact, those indicated in conclusions, which can eventually reduce their productive years, have not studied them. Avoid recommendations not arising from the study. It is suggested to refine the conclusions and recommendations.	
Optional/General comments	The study has allowed to know the perception of the charcoal producers with respect to the health problems to which they are subjected in this work; information that must be properly used to implement improvement strategies. The methodology and obtaining of results has been adequate; therefore, I suggest that the article be published once the observations indicated in the evaluation format.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Jorge Isaac Castro Bedriñana***
Department, University & Country	***Universidad Nacional del Centro del Perú, Peru***