

Manuscript: **“Financement De La Caisse De Solidarité Du District Sanitaire De Youwarou Au Mali : Une Revue Systématique De Littérature”**

Submitted: 20 April 2020

Accepted: 12 January 2021

Published: 31 January 2021

Corresponding Author: Dr. Ousmane Sylla

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n3p190

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Moussa Sanogo,

University of Medicine and Pharmacy in Mali, Department of Public Health

Reviewer 2: Akmel Meless Siméon,

Alassane Ouattara-Bouaké (Côte 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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: April 22	Date Review Report Submitted: May 5
Manuscript Title: System of Reference / Evacuation of Pregnant Women in Mali: Difficult Financing of the Solidarity Fund of the Health District of Youwarou	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.	1.5
The title and the content are not consistent; we get lost in the logic of the author	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1.5
Rather, we expect a method drawn from the research methodology and which could adapt to this research context. From an evacuation reference system, the conclusion	

seems rather to focus on the practice of caesarean section, while it is the funding of the solidarity fund that draws attention through the title.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
Review the language with short sentences that make sense and focus on the theme of research. we can shorten the content and focus on the essentials.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
The methodology must be better explained and respect the rules in this area, the processing, analysis and interpretation mechanism clearly provided.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
The body of the text is interesting but very long and confused, we get lost.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
It is vast since the initial objectives are not clear and the concepts made operational.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
The references are interesting but less precise. The presentation of the bibliographic references follows rules and must relate to official documents, articles, and other scientific productions, the whole must follow for example the rule of Vancouver,....	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This work needs a major revision to establish the concepts, define a clear and precise problem, adopt a coherent, logical methodology and support the analysis of the data on suitable bibliographic references. Consideration of the observations, a return to the primary data and an in-depth and quality analysis could give a second chance to minor revisions therefore to possibilities of its publication eventually

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: Akmel Meless Siméon	
University/Country Alassane Ouattara-Bouaké (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 11/12/20	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/12/20
Manuscript Title: Financement de la Caisse de Solidarité du District Sanitaire de Youwarou au Mali : une revue systématique de littérature	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0517/20	
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>	
Titre clair	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Résumé assez-bien présenté	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Des fautes existent dans le travail	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
La méthodologie doit être réorganisée	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Résultats acceptables	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Assez-bien présentée	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
A revoir	

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):

Intégrer les questions et les objectifs spécifiques. Revoir la méthodologie. Intégrer les opinions ou les assertions des auteurs dans la discussion. Reprendre les références bibliographiques.

