

Paper: **“Impacts Socio-Économiques Du Diabète Chez Les Diabétiques”**

Corresponding Author: Adebayo Alassani

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n18p290

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Kamissoko Aly Badra, Guinea

Reviewer 3: Moutawakilou Gomina, Université de Parakou (République du Bénin)

Reviewer 4: Donthy Kouakoubah Richard KOUAKOU, Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 5: Dr. GAMBOGOU Banfitebiyi

Published: 30.06.2020

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

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: Dr. <b>GAMBOGOU Banfitebiyi (Ph.D)</b>	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: <b>04/06/2020</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>11/06/2020</b>
Manuscript Title : <b>Impacts social et économique du diabète chez les patients diabétiques suivis à Porto-Novo en 2016</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0547/20</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## **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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title is clearly informative</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The aim are clear. The methodology and results described in abstract are clear. However, minor correction are necessary</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>There are clearly some spelling mistakes and grammatical errors that author must</i>	

<i>correct</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The process of subject selection are clear. Authors are well described the variables, the study methods, and there are enough detail in order to replicate the study. However, the statistical method are not presented.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Introduction: They are some information about what is known about the topic. The research question are clearly outlined and justified what is already know about the topic. Results and Discussion: The comments of table are well done. However, the authors does not discussed the results from multiple angle and placed into context with being interpreted.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The conclusion put in evidence the significant points of the article and is well supported by the content of the text.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The references are recent and relevant. However, the authors are not correctly referenced according to the journal instruction but it is appropriate to the study done.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

*For my comments, I suggest that the author refer to the comments and suggestion in the manuscript to enhance the impact of his work.*

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

*The article submitted for our review has been well written and the results have been well presented. However, it remains for the improvement of the quality of the article the author must refer to our comments and suggestion in the article.*