



Paper: “Etudes Rétrospectives Des Facteurs Individuels Et Contextuels Sur La Variation De La Mortalité Des Enfants De Moins De 5 Ans Durant l’Année 2018 En Guinée”

Corresponding Author: Sidiki Kaba

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n27p173

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: El-Mouhdi Karima, GEOPAC Center, Scientific Institute, Mohammed V University in Rabat, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Bouba Djourdebbe Franklin IFORD/Université de Yaoundé II, Cameroun

Published: 30.09.2020

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: El-Mouhdi Karima	Email: karima_elmouhdi@um5.ac.ma
University/Country: GEOPAC Center, Scientific Institute, Mohammed V University in Rabat, Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 06 Aout 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 16 Aout 2020
Manuscript Title: Influence Des Facteurs Individuels Et Contextuels Sur La Variation De La Mortalité Des Enfants De Moins De 5 Ans En Guinée	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 65.08.2020	
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.	2
L'article traite la mortalité infantile durant l'année 2018 tandis que ceci n'a pas été mentionné dans le titre.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Oui	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Oui	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
Les méthodes doivent apparaître directement après la section d'introduction comme une section a part et ce n'est le cas	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	1
Le contenu doit être retravaillé sous forme d'un paper scientifique: IMRAD	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Malgré que le Résumé soit exact, il contient des abréviations qui ne doivent pas être apparaître, tandis que la conclusion est trop longue.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
Oui	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- SVP, mentionner dans le titre l'année 2018 ;
- SVP, éviter l'utilisation d'abréviation dans le résumé ;
- SVP, faire éclairer la différence entre les facteurs : familiaux, individuels, textuels, régionaux ;
- SVP, respecter la forme IMRAD: Introduction-Méthodes-Résultats-And-Discussion et conclusion;
- SVP, essayer de revoir la conclusion, elle est trop longue.

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 BOUBA DJOURDEBBE Franklin	
University/Country: IFORD/Université de Yaoundé II, Cameroun	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 18/08/2020
Manuscript Title: Influence Des Facteurs Individuels Et Contextuels Sur La Variation De La Mortalité Des Enfants De Moins De 5 Ans En Guinée	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 65_08_2020 ISSN: 1857 - 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
L'article est relativement bien structuré. L'orthographe est acceptable.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3,5
Les méthodes appropriés et claires	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3,5
Le contenu de l'article est acceptable. Toutefois, il y a des rubriques à retravailler pour améliorer le texte (cf. texte annoté)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
La conclusion ou le résumé sont relativement en lien avec le contenu de l'article, bien qu'il ait des éléments à améliorer.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Les références assez exhaustives	

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):

Cf. observations et commentaires dans le texte annoté.