Paper: **"Déterminants de la morbidité et de la mortalité dues au choléra à Lubumbashi, République Démocratique du Congo : étude cas-témoins non appariée"**

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: AGOÏNON Norbert	
University/Country: Université de Parakou/Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 1-04-2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 19-4-2022
Manuscript Title: **Determinants of cholera morbidity and mortality in Lubumbashi, Democratic Republic of Congo: unpaired case-control study".**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 34.03.2022	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
The content fits well with the title except for formal errors that need to be corrected	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
The structuring with subheadings seems to me abnormal	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
The style needs to be improved	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
he method is clear, but it seems to me too detailed	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
The results are clear, but the structuring is a little problematic. The discussion is too detailed. Proposals are made for its improvement.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
Yes, but the content needs to be reorganised	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
This seems to me to be well presented	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It would be advisable to take into account the proposals as far as possible, in particular the form of the abstract, the presentation of the geographical framework, the reduction of certain details in the approach and the discussion. This will improve the scientific quality of the work.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

If all comments and recommendations are taken into account, the article can be published.

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: AKMEL Meless Siméon	
University/Country: Université Alassane Ouattara (Bouaké, Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received:19/05/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/05/22
Manuscript Title: Déterminants de la morbidité et de la mortalité dus au cholera à Lubumbashi, République Démocratique du Congo: etude cas-témoins non appariée	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0334/22	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**

(Please insert your comments) Le titre est précis et original	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) Résumé acceptable	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) Travail agréable à la lecture	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) Bonne méthodologie	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) Les résultats sont bien presentés. Toutefois, les différentes sections et sous sections ne sont pas numérotées. A revoir La discussion est acceptable	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) La conclusion a été harmonisée	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
(Please insert your comments) Les references sont assez bien présentées. Il existe quelques soucis mineurs liés à l'ordre alphabétique. A harmoniser	

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):

Les remarques ont été prises en compte dans l'ensemble, malgré quelques observations mineures. Le travail peut être publié.