Paper: **"Etude Diagnostique et Prospective de L'enseignement Primaire en Territoire de Mahagi à L'ère de la Gratuité Effective en République Démocratique du Congo"**

Corresponding Author: Kisembo Isaac

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Elena Hunt
Laurentian University, Canada

Reviewer 2: Benie Aloh Jean Martial Hillarion
Université Félix Houphouet Boigny, Cote d'Ivoire

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: E Hunt	
University/Country: Laurentian University, Canada	
Date Manuscript Received: Aug 15	Date Review Report Submitted: Aug 21
Manuscript Title: **Esquisse de la carte scolaire de l'enseignement primaire du territoire de Mahagi/ République Démocratique du Congo** *(Etude diagnostique et prospective à l'ère de la gratuité de l'enseignement de base en République Démocratique du Congo*)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0812-22	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**3**
Please see my remarks directly in the manuscript.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) Please see my remarks directly in the manuscript.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) Please see my remarks directly in the manuscript.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	

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):

Je vous félicité de cette étude rigoureuse, méthodique, courageuse et de grande importance.
Je suggère quelques changements directement dans le texte à l'aide de la fonction 'track changes', tout simplement pour augmenter la compréhension du texte, la clarté et la qualité de l'expression écrite.

Merci de m'avoir confié la révision.

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: BENIE ALOH JEAN MARTIAL HILLARION	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouet Boigny / Institut Pédagogique National de l'Enseignement Technique et Professionnel (IPNETP)	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/08/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/08/2022
Manuscript Title: **Esquisse de la carte scolaire de l'enseignement primaire du territoire de Mahagi/ République Démocratique du Congo** *(Etude diagnostique et prospective à l'ère de la gratuité de l'enseignement de base en RD Congo)*	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0812/22	
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.

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)	

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

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: