

Paper: “Consommation Des Aphrodisiaques Chez Les adolescents Et Adultes À Kinshasa : Prévalence Et Facteurs Associés”

Submitted: 08 February 2022

Accepted: 14 June 2022

Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Didier Ndombe

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n21p245](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n21p245)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Emilienne Grace Nkoyock
Catholic University of Central Africa, Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Emilienne Grace NKOYOCK	
University/Country: Catholic University of Central Africa / Cameroon	
Date Manuscript Received: May 7, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: May 14, 2022
Manuscript Title: Aphrodisiac Consumption Among Adolescents And Adults In Kinshasa: Prevalence And Explanatory Factors	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0254/22	
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.	2.5
Ajouter la période d'étude dans le titre. Ce titre ne reflète pas l'approche mixte de votre étude, mais plus tôt l'approche quantitative. Ajuster votre titre pour ressortir le volet qualitatif de votre étude.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2.5
Dans votre résumé, vous énumérez deux objectifs spécifiques, mais vous nous présentez trois résultats. Ajoutez l'objectif correspondant à votre volet qualitatif. Dans votre méthode, vous ne mentionnez que l'enquête transversal, aucune allusion du volet qualitatif n'est faite. Pour un étude d'association et de prevalence qui sont des études descriptives, on a pas besoin d'avoir le volet qualitatif.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Les phrases sont parfois très longues, ce qui ne facilite pas la compréhension.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Les variables recherchées par le volet qualitatif n'ont pas été spécifiées .	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2.5
Votre étude est mixte , où sont les résultats de la partie qualitative?	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Certains éléments du résumé, de la discussion et de la conclusion ne sont pas présentés dans les résultats.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Attention à la concordance des références	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):