

Manuscript: “**Amélioration des conditions d’hygiène et d’assainissement dans la commune de Zè au Bénin**”

Submitted: 12 October 2020

Accepted: 11 May 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Armelle Sabine Yélignan Hounkpatin

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n17p189

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Doukoure Daouda, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: N’guessan Tenguel Sosthene, Université Nangui Abrogoua

Reviewer 3: Akmel Meless Siméon, Université Alassane Ouattara, Bouaké, Côte d’Ivoire

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 05 Janvier 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/01/2021
Manuscript Title: Amélioration des conditions d’hygiène et d’assainissement dans la commune de Zè au Bénin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 104.10.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes / No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes / No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes / No	

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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are not few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The study methods are explained clearly.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
The results are not clear and contain errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
The references are not comprehensive and not appropriate.	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Au niveau de l'introduction, l'auteur doit préciser la question de recherche qui guide cette étude. (les auteurs n'ont pas pris en compte les remarques)

Au niveau des résultats, l'auteur doit combiner les caractéristiques et non les placer distinctement comme il a fait dans son travail. (l'analyse qualitative reste peu exploitée, qu'est ce qui explique ce fait ?)

De plus au niveau toujours des résultats, le volet qualitatif qui n'est pas trop visible dans l'analyse. Revoir cette défaillance dans l'analyse des résultats.

Au niveau de la bibliographie, il y a un désordre de l'emplacement des années. (précisez nous la norme choisie et aligner votre référence bibliographique sur ce modèle, car on ne comprends pas cette manière de référencer la bibliographie).

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: N'GUESSAN Tenguel Sosthene	Email:
University/Country: Université Nangui Abrogoua	
Date Manuscript Received: 4 janvier 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 26 janvier 2021
Manuscript Title: Amélioration des conditions d'hygiène et d'assainissement dans la commune de Zè au Bénin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 10104/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes /No	

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>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Le résumé ne fait cependant pas cas de la méthode d'échantillonnage ayant conduit à la sélection des zones bénéficiaires et non bénéficiaires</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>La description de la méthodologie manque de cohérence. Il est suggéré aux auteurs la structuration suivante : Type d'étude, Cadre d'étude, Cibles, Echantillonnage, Variable, Collecte de données, Analyse des données</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>La description des résultats est sommaire. Pourtant l'étude est à la fois quantitative et qualitative. Une analyse plus poussée ou approfondie est exigée. Par ailleurs, l'étude a une visée comparative ; or celle-ci n'est nullement perçue dans tout le corps du texte. La présentation du tableau 2 est inappropriée. Il conviendrait de présenter les résultats par variables et faire une analyse plus poussée.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>La conclusion ne tire pas les grands enseignements de l'étude. Elle mérite d'être plus soutenue</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Les références sont appropriées car actuelles. Une référence appelé dans le corps du texte ne figure cependant pas dans la bibliographie</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):

La description de la méthodologie manque de cohérence. Il est suggéré aux auteurs la structuration suivante : Type d'étude, Cadre d'étude, Cibles, Echantillonnage, Variable, Collecte de données, Analyse des données

La description des résultats est sommaire. Pourtant l'étude est à la fois quantitative et qualitative. Une analyse plus poussée ou approfondie est exigée. Par ailleurs, l'étude a une visée comparative ; or celle-ci n'est nullement perçue dans tout le corps du texte. La présentation du tableau 2 est inappropriée. Il conviendrait de présenter les résultats par variables et faire une analyse plus poussée.

La conclusion ne tire pas les grands enseignements de l'étude. Elle mérite d'être plus soutenue

Les références sont appropriées car actuelles. Une référence appelé dans le corps du texte ne figure cependant pas dans la bibliographie



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: AKMEL Meless Siméon	
University/Country: Université Alassane Ouattara (Bouaké-Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/04/21	Date Review Report Submitted: 30/04/21
Manuscript Title: Amélioration des conditions d'hygiène et d'assainissement dans la commune de Zè au Bénin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 104.10.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes /No	

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> Clear	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Corrigé	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Travail assez-bien écrit	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Observations prises en compte	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Observations prises en compte	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> A améliorer	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Observations prises en compte	

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):

L'auteur a bel et bien pris en compte les observations. Les remarques mineures n'entâchent en rien la qualité du travail. L'article peut être publié.