Corresponding Author: Gratien Mokonzi Bambanota

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abdelali Kaaouachi
Mohammed I University, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Gboisso Asobee
Université de Kisangani, RD Congo

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: GBOISSO ASOBEE Oscar	
University/Country: Université de Kisangani/RDCongo	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **Disparités dans la scolarisation primaire et secondaire en République Démocratique du Congo de 2006 à 2018** **Disparities in primary and secondary education in the Democratic Republic of Congo from 2006 to 2018**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: **0103/23**	
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**
A small clarification is missing in the title. The rating 4 is attributed to this title because it is not only a question of noting the disparities between the provinces, but also of presenting their intensity in them. and therefore, only one clarification is missing because of the absence of the concept "magnitude"	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**2**
In this abstract, the purpose and methods are not clearly specified, except for the results which are clearly shown. It is interesting that the methods, especially, are specified.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
I did not notice any grammatical errors or spelling mistakes in this article, except on page 6: Les disparités sont analyséea s entre les provinces,…/ Les disparités sont analysées entre les provinces…	
Also, it should be noted that in footnote 1, the total range of variation should be abbreviated as the coefficient of variation in the same footnote. And to standardize, it should also be accompanied by the abbreviation of the coefficient of variation.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
Reading on page 6, it appears that the methods are well explained to the point that even the less knowledgeable reader can understand.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
The results are clear insofar as they are consistent with the objectives and methods adopted by the study. I did not notice any procedural or writing errors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
Indeed, the conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content, as they are all based on the structure as proposed by the methods based on the objectives of this study.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
The references are understandable and appropriate, except for " Fjarraud. (2017). L'éducation, une arme contre la pauvreté. Expresso", because of the point (punctuation) in front of Fjarraud	

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):

My comments on the scorecard are enough

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Nothing to report

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!

Date Manuscript Received:30/12/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/01/2023
Manuscript Title: **Disparities in primary and secondary education in the Democratic Republic of Congo from 2006 to 2018**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0103/22	
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**
The title is clear and very informative, it engenders the content of the paper.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**

The abstract presents the object of the study and also some results. However, it does not provide any information on the methodology adopted to address the various research questions.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
The text is well written. Absence of writing errors. The text does not adopt the same font (for example, the text after Table 2 and Table 5)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
The methodology is very clear for the synchronic analysis and the diachronic analysis of disparities. Techniques have been described with explanation of the thresholds allowing decision-making.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
The results are presented without errors and are convincingly discussed.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
The conclusion reviews the content of the article, in particular its main results.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
Yes, very comprehensive.	

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):

- Add the methodology in the abstract of the paper.
- Use a single text font; that recommended by the editor of the journal.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: