

Paper: “**Influence des Facteurs individuels et Contextuels Sur la Réhydratation par Voie Orale des Enfants Diarrhéiques de Moins de Cinq ans en Côte d’Ivoire**”

Submitted: 14 November 2022

Accepted: 21 February 2023

Published: 28 February 2023

Corresponding Author: N'goran Boris

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n6p423

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Antoine Banza
UNFPA, DRC

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: Antoine Banza	
University/Country: UNFPA/DRC	
Date Manuscript Received: 31/01/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/02/2023
Manuscript Title: INFLUENCE OF INDIVIDUAL AND CONTEXTUAL FACTORS ON ORAL REHYDRATION OF DIARRHEIC CHILDREN UNDER FIVE YEARS OLD IN CÔTE D'IVOIRE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1178/22	
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.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No comments	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Refer to my observations noted in the document.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Grammatical or spelling errors are minimal and therefore negligible.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Abbreviate Sample Presentation	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Make the interpretation of statistical analysis results less technical. In other words, reduce the results of statistical tests in the text.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No comments	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Non comments	

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):

- Reformulate the general objective of the study in the light of my observations;
- State your position by giving clear directions to your study in relation to the theoretical approaches presented.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Publish the document after the integration of my observations.