

Manuscript: “**Connaissances, Attitudes Et Pratiques En Matiere De Cancer Du Col De L’uterus (Ccu) Chez Les Professionnels De Sante A Parakou Au Benin En 2016’**”

**Submitted: 28 January 2021**

**Accepted: 22 June 2021**

**Published: 31 July 2021**

Corresponding Author: Achille Awadé Afoukou Obossou

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n25p290

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Tchente Nguefack C., Douala, Cameroun

**Reviewer 2:** Blinded

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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: TCHENTE NGUEFACK C	
University/Country: DOUALA/CAMEROUN	
Date Manuscript Received: 08/02/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/05/2021
Manuscript Title: CONNAISSANCES, ATTITUDES ET PRATIQUES EN MATIERE DE CANCER DU COL DE L'UTERUS (CCU) CHEZ LES PROFESSIONNELS DE SANTE A PARAKOU AU BENIN EN 2016	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0243/21	
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>3</b>
<i>(The methodology is very summarize here, it should be developed a little bit )</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Some corrections have been done)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(They have not explained how they noted questions before additions and calculation of percentage)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4.5</b>
<i>(Some remarks have been done )</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(see the comment on the conclusion)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>(They should be actualized, some are very old references)</i>	

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

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

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

There are lot of tables and figures, you can fused some only if the number is correct for the editors. The discussion seems long, it can be reduced.