

Paper: “**Structure du Budget D’investissements Publics de Sante Dans la Region du Centre/Cameroun (2013-2017)**”

**Submitted: 02 October 2020**

**Accepted: 18 December 2020**

**Published: 31 December 2020**

Corresponding Author: Louis Merlin Tsamo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n35p188

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nzohabonayo Anaclet  
ENA, Burundi

Reviewer 2: Neba Cletus Yah  
University of Douala, Cameroon

## ***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: Nzohabonayo Anaclet	
University/Country: ENA-Burundi	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/10/2020
Manuscript Title: <b>STRUCTURE DU BUDGET D’INVESTISSEMENTS</b>	

<b>PUBLICS DE SANTE DANS LA REGION DU CENTRE/CAMEROUN (2013-2017)</b>
ESJ Manuscript Number: 67.10.2020.
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
I. Le texte comporte plusieurs fautes d'orthographe et d'accord qui empêchent le lecteur de se concentrer sur le fond. Les rédacteurs semblent avoir négligé les règles élémentaires d'une dissertation scientifique. Par exemple, les sigles utilisés ne sont jamais définis en toutes lettres nulle part. Egalement, le texte et les notes en bas de page n'ont pas la même police et ne suivent pas les normes académiques. La numérotation des diverses parties de l'article laisse à désirer (III. Principaux résultats II.1 Offre de soins dans la Région du Centre et la partie discussion qui n'est pas numérotée). Les principales observations sont en jaune dans le texte.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain</b>	<b>2</b>

<b>errors.</b>	
<p>1. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La démarche de l'article est à revoir</p> <p>Tel que l'article se présente c'est comme s'il y a eu de données qui ont été récoltées sur base d'enquête alors qu'il semble qu'il s'agit d'une analyse documentaire des éléments tirés des divers rapports de projets. Il fallait emprunter simplement la démarche classique consistant à critiquer et à tirer des conclusions à partir des analyses pour formuler des pistes d'amélioration dans l'avenir.</p> <p>Il faut revoir l'organisation de l'article en enlevant les titres comme principaux résultats et discussion. Renforcer la base théorique en faisant une revue de littérature pour montrer l'état actuel des connaissances sur le sujet. Cela permettrait d'appuyer vos points de vue pour ce qui est du Cameroun.</p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La conclusion et le résumé sont à refaire en fonction de nouveaux ajouts</p>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les références bibliographiques sont à refaire et à enrichir en fonction des recherches qui seront faites pour compléter l'article</p>	

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

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

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

Pour que l'article soit publiable il faut:

1. Revoir le texte en enlevant systématiquement toutes les coquilles ;
2. Au niveau du fond, ajouter une partie sur la revue de littérature pour montrer l'état actuel des connaissances au sujet du thème traité ;
3. Reconfigurer l'article dans ses titres en enlevant les titres comme principaux résultats et discussion ;
4. Revoir les références et les adapter aux normes scientifiques.

**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: NEBA CLETUS YAH	
University/Country: Cameroon	
Date Manuscript Received: 11/12/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/12/2020
Manuscript Title: STRUCTURE DU BUDGET D'INVESTISSEMENTS PUBLICS DE SANTE DANS LA REGION DU CENTRE/CAMEROUN (2013-2017)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1067/20	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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

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

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

Very minor grammatical errors

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

Accept paper for publication