
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 06-09-17
Manuscript Title: REFLEXION SUR LES ENJEUX EPISTEMOLOGIQUE ET METHODOLOGIQUE DE L'APPROCHE ANTHROPOLOGIQUE EN RECHERCHE MEDICALE SUR LA MALADIE CHRONIQUE EN AFRIQUE A TRAVERS L'EXEMPLE DU VIH/SIDA.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-lesspoint 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. <i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. <i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> Faire ressortir dans le résumé, l'objectif, la méthodologie et les résultats, éventuellement les perspectives	2
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanationis recommendable)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Dire un mot sur les branches de l'anthropologie, quitte à préciser qu'elles utilisent fondamentalement en commun l'approche qualitative en complement de l'approche quantitative par moment. Il ne faut pas trop généraliser en parlant de l'Afrique alors que votre terrain concerne la Côte d'Ivoire, surtout que nulle part nous n'avons pas vraiment les résultats et terrains d'étude des autres travaux dont vous parlez. Vos critiques de la démarche de l'épidémiologie ne sont pas fondées sur des données concrètes or il le faut.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

La prise en compte des observations et suggestions faites devrait permettre la publication de l'article qui est innovant.

