

Manuscript: **“Différences De Mortalité Des Enfants De Moins De Cinq Ans En Côte d’Ivoire : Une Analyse Comparée Des Ratios De 1994 À 2016”**

Submitted: 22 July 2020

Accepted: 21 January 2021

Published: 31 January 2021

Corresponding Author: Dr. Ezzo Emmanuel

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n3p220

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gnamien Konan Bah Modeste,
Jean Lorougnon Guede University, Cote d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: El-Mouhdi Karima,
Universit Med V de Rabat

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:
University/Country: Universit Med V de Rabat	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/10/2020
Manuscript Title: Les différences de mortalité des enfants en Côte d'Ivoire, de 1994 à 2016	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0813/20	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The instructions on the title is inserted in the document</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The corrections requested concern the formatting of the abstract according to academic standards.	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>Excellent</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The requested corrections are indicated inside the manuscript.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>Yes</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The requested corrections are indicated inside the manuscript.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>the references to be added by the author have been indicated inside the manuscript</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

- Presentation of the study site in the materials and methods section
- Rationale for the importance of the study

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

- The author must make sure to present the manuscript in accordance with the Formatting according to the standards of the Journal "ESJ".
- The author must add missing references to avoid plagiarism.
- The author should present his or her tables in an academic format and explain the abbreviations used in each table.

