

Manuscript: **“Facteurs Associés à la Vaccination Complète chez les Enfants de 12 à 23 Mois en Guinée”**

Submitted: 07 September 2020

Accepted: 27 April 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Mamadou Dian Dilé Diallo

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n17p80

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Sidiki Kaba, IFORD (Institut de Formation et de Recherche Démographiques), Université de Yaoundé 2, Cameroun

Reviewer 2: Emmanuel Ngwe, Cameroon

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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.
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: Sidiki KABA	
University/Country: IFORD (Institut de Formation et de Recherche Démographiques), Université de Yaoundé 2, Cameroun.	
Date Manuscript Received: 30/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 02/11/2020
Manuscript Title: Facteurs associés la vaccination complète chez les enfants de 12 à 23 mois en Guinée	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 94.09.2020	
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: 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.

<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.	4
<i>Insérez “à”.</i> Facteurs associés à la vaccination complète chez les enfants de 12 à 23 mois en Guinée	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	3

results.	
<i>Indiquez la méthode utilisée. Elle doit être visible dans le résumé.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Plusieurs phrases sont à reformuler.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Utilisez la régression appropriée.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Il existe des problèmes d'interprétation des résultats de la régression.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Améliorez le résumé et la conclusion en se référant des commentaires insérés dans le texte.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>Les référencements sont à reprendre.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Corrigez le titre ;
- Respectez la norme IMRaD : Introduction – Méthodes – Résultats – and – Discussion et Conclusion ;
- Utilisez la régression appropriée ;
- Revoyez la présentation des résultats ;

Revoyez les références, respectez les normes de la revue ;

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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.
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: Emmanuel NGWE	Email:
University/Country: CAMEROON	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 08/11/2020
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ No : YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ No 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.

<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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Better title should be “les déterminants de la vaccination complète des enfants de 12 à 23 mois en Guinée”	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	3

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The main statistical analysis tools used in this study are not mentioned in the abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
There are French language errors and mistakes in this article and I tried to correct some. Please see the reviewed article with my comments attached to my message.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, but the main hypothesis to be tested by the study is not stated as it should be.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, nothing to report.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, nothing to report.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, nothing to report	

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):

- Add some data related to the demographic context
- Add a brief literature review
- Add the main hypothesis to be tested by the analysis
- Correct writing and language errors

