

**Paper: “Perception, Motivation et Acceptation des Acteurs de l’Unité de Formation et de Recherche des Sciences Médicales d’Abidjan (Ufrsma) Face à l’Intégration de la Formation à Distance (FAD)”**

**Submitted: 28 November 2022**

**Accepted: 10 January 2023**

**Published: 31 January 2023**

Corresponding Author: Ainyakou Taiba Germaine

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n1p109](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n1p109)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jonas Kwabla Fiadzawoo  
University for Development Studies, Ghana

Reviewer 2: Seka Yapi Arsene Thierry  
Ecole Normale Supérieure Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Bakayoko Ismaila  
Université Felix Houphouët-Boigny, Côte 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:	
University/Country: Ghana	
Date Manuscript Received: 2022-12-08	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>PERCEPTION, MOTIVATION ET ACCEPTATION DES ACTEURS DE L'UNITE DE FORMATION ET DE RECHERCHE DES SCIENCES MEDICALES D'ABIDJAN (UFRSMA) FACE A L'INTEGRATION DE LA FORMATION A DISTANCE (FAD).</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

## 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] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Yes the title is clear)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(The abstract needs total revision. The abstract is too long. 422 words for an abstract is unacceptable. It should be revised to include only the essential parts: objectives, research method, data collection instruments, analysis, results and recommendations)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The errors are very few. I have indicated them in the work for the researcher to correct)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The study method needs more clarification)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The results clear)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Both in-text citations and main references need to be review to conform to the APA referencing style)</i>	

**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):**

1. There is need for you to review the abstract. It is too verbose and you should to leave only salient points in the abstract. The salient points include: the aim of the study, the theory explored, the methodology/approach adopted, data collection and analysis, findings and recommendations. It should at least not be more than 300 words.
2. The organization of the introduction is not well structured, it should be reviewed/
3. Referencing style is not clear. It will be preferable to use APA referencing style.
4. All tables used in the work should be well introduced and be giving titles

# 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: BAKAYOKO ISMAILA	
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/01/2023
Manuscript Title: <b>PERCEPTION, MOTIVATION ET ACCEPTATION DES ACTEURS DE L'UNITE DE FORMATION ET DE RECHERCHE DES SCIENCES MEDICALES D'ABIDJAN (UFRSMA) FACE A L'INTEGRATION DE LA FORMATION A DISTANCE (FAD).</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>3</b>
<i>avec proposition modification de compréhension</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>A REVOIR</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>A CORRIGER</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Rien à signaler</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Rien à signaler</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Rien à signaler)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Rien à signaler)</i>	

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

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

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

A revoir le titre et le résumé de l'article

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# 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: SEKA YAPI	
University/Country: Ecole Normale Supérieure CÔTE D'IVOIRE	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/12/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/01/23
Manuscript Title: PERCEPTION, MOTIVATION ET ACCEPTATION DES ACTEURS DE L'UNITE DE FORMATION ET DE RECHERCHE DES SCIENCES MEDICALES D'ABIDJAN (UFRSMA) FACE A L'INTEGRATION DE LA FORMATION A DISTANCE (FAD).	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 21.12. 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(The title is clear and it has a link with the content of the article)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Objects are clearly presented so as methods and results)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(No grammatical errors, no spelling mistakes in french)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The study methods are clearly explained )</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The results are very clear)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The conclusions have a link with the content of the text)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The references are recent, comprehensive and appropriate)</i>	

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

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):** The article is a very good one and well written but phone numbers are useless here.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:** This article reserves to be published rapidly to my point of view.