

Paper: “CoViD-19, capital humain et crise économique en Afrique subsaharienne : une analyse prospective”

Submitted: 31 August 2020

Accepted: 19 October 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding Author: Nkwenka Nyanda Patrick Geoffroy

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n31p162](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n31p162)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: 07.09 Tabin Lissendja
University of Kisangani, DRC

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: MEL Meledje Melaine
Felix Houphouet Boigny, Cote d’Ivoire

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: Tabin Lissendja Bahama	
University/Country: University of Kisangani, DRC	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/09/2020
Manuscript Title: CoVid-19, capital humain et crise économique en Afrique subsaharienne : une analyse prospective.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 45.09.2020	
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.	3

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, the title of the article is clear and in perfect harmony with the content of the paper.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, everything is clear at this level	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The article is very clear and there no more grammatical errors and spelling mistakes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, the study method is clearly explained in accordance with the way the article is presented.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>It is necessary that the study data be updated. The reference to April 2020 seems very far away for a topical topic. However, the reading does not indicate any evidence between the human capital or the health status impacted by Covid-19 and the economic benefits to the region during the severe period of pandemic.</p> <p>It should also be noted that sub-Saharan Africa has not been heavily affected by Covid-19 deaths like other countries in the world. There is evidence that the economies of countries in the region have been more affected by the measures taken by different governments to combat the pandemic than the impact of deaths or contamination on the region's labour force.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>A prospective study of Covid-19 is expected to be correct in April or May 2020 while the pandemic was widespread in both the world and sub-Saharan Africa. Publishing the study during this period would be relevant. But in September 2020, when the peak of the pandemic is far exceeded in several countries of the world including the region under review, while the borders are open, including airports and some pandemic measures are lifted, seems to me less relevant.</p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: MEL MeledjeMelaine	Email:
University/Country: FELIX HOUPHOUET BOIGNY	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: CoViD-19, capital humain et crise économique en Afrique subsaharienne : une analyse prospective	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 45.09.2020.	
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	5

article.	
<i>(Le titre est précis et en adéquation avec le contenu du présent article.)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Les éléments contenus dans le résumé respectent la structuration habituelle. Evidemment dans une étude prospective, la méthodologie se rapporte surtout à un canevas théorique.)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Les auteurs prennent soin de présenter un document relativement propre. Les fautes grammaticales sont quasi inexistantes.)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(La méthodologie utilisée permet une bonne approche.)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Le corps du sujet est bien établi. Les auteurs font montre d'un certain professionnalisme.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(La conclusion est bien structurée.)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Les références permettent de consolider l'argumentaire des auteurs. Cependant, si elles semblent appropriées, faut noter que manque le numéro de page. Une exigence qui commence à être énorme.)</i>	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: