

Paper: **“Fertility in Africa: Dynamics and Challenges of Development”**

Submitted: 14 December 2020

Accepted: 15 April 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Abdourahmane Mbade Sene

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n13p43

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: John Strait
Sam Houston State University, USA

Reviewer 2: Muhammed A. Obomeghie
Auchi Polytechnic Auchi Edo State, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Bupinder Zutshi
Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India

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: Prof. Bupinder Zutshi		
University/Country: Former Professor, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India		
Date Manuscript Received: 18th December 20		Date Review Report Submitted: 24th Dec 2020
Manuscript Title: FERTILITY IN AFRICA: DYNAMICS AND CHALLENGES OF DEVELOPMENT		
ESJ Manuscript Number:		
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes		
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No Yes		
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No 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>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The title of the paper clearly exhibits the adequately the contents of the research paper presented by the author. The title is in sync with the objectives of the paper.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The abstract synthase appropriately the contents, research methodology and findings of the research paper for readers .</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The language used by author is clear and appropriately articulated without significant levels of grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. The research article has all ingredients for passing the test of language used for readers.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Research methodology and research tools used are appropriate and clearly representing the objectives of the research paper. Data used by the researcher is authentic and explains the research questions/ hypothesis set for the research design.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The interpretation and the results of the papers clearly represent the data presented and its examinations arrived at by using Principal Component Analysis (PCA). The findings are clear and are not in conflict with the data presented in the text.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The conclusions drawn are accurate and in sync with the findings and interpretations of the data analysis.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>References are comprehensive , relevant to the research theme and in sync with the objectives of the research design. However author should follow guidelines of the journal while presenting the references.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The research paper is well articulated and contents are useful for readers as well as for policy makers

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

May check whether the references presented are in sync with journal requirements.

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: Dr Muhammed A. Obomeghie	
University/Country: Auchi Polytechnic Auchi Edo State, Nigaria	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 4 th January, 2021
Manuscript Title: Fertility in Africa: Dynamics and Challenges of Development	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 12109/20	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title of the paper is clear and adequate	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract clearly presents objectives, methods and results of the study	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are few grammatical and spelling mistakes however, construction of sentences should be looked at by the author e.g. on page three the author used catching up instead of catching-up. Also on page seven in the last paragraph, the authors use of bracket is not proper.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> 1. Methods are not clearly stated explained 2. Author relied on already explained results	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> 1. There is no results section to show points of action 2 A special section for results and interpretation should be created	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Conclusion is in line with content however, they are not tied to findings by other researchers findings.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Some cited materials in the body of the work are not on the references, e.g. World Bank, 2008 and 2016	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

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: John Strait	
University/Country: Sam Houston State University, United States	
Date Manuscript Received: 1/21/21	Date Review Report Submitted: 1/24/21
Manuscript Title: <i>Fertility in Africa: Dynamics and Challenges of Development</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No NO	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) I think</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments) There are some definite grammatical errors in the paper</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The results of PCA need to be included	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
See attached sheet	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

SEE ATTACHED REVIEW

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: SEE ATTACHED REVIEW