

Manuscript: “**Economie d’échelle à l’interne et Covid-19 : Une tentative de voie de sortie en RDC**”

Submitted: 01 March 2021

Accepted: 05 April 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Tsongo Kayiri Jean de Dieu

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n12p210

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Papy Bonkena Bokombola, Université de Kinshasa, République Démocratique du Congo (RDC)

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: Papy Bonkena Bokombola | Email: |
| University/Country: Université de Kinshasa/République Démocratique du Congo (RDC) | |
| Date Manuscript Received: | Date Review Report Submitted: |
| Manuscript Title: “Economie d’échelle à l’interne et Covid-19: une tentative de vie de sortie” | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: | |
| 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. | 3 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> L’aspect Covid-19 n’est pas développé dans le corps du manuscrit. | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |

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