

**Paper: “Adhesion du Personnel Soignant a la Nouvelle Loi de Legalisation de l’Avortement au Benin”**

**Submitted: 28 October 2023**

**Accepted: 28 December 2023**

**Published: 31 January 2024**

Corresponding Author: Sèdjro Raoul Atade

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n3p70

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ousmane Sylla

Direction Générale de la Santé de l'Hygiène Publique/ Sous-Direction Santé de la Reproduction, Bamako/Mali

Reviewer 2: Jean Luc Kambire

Université de Ouahigouya, Burkina Faso

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: KAMBIRE JEAN LUC	
University/Country: Université de Ouahigouya/ Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: ADHESION DU PERSONNEL SOIGNANT A LA NOUVELLE LOI DE LEGALISATION DE L'AVORTEMENT AU BENIN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1125	
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>RAS</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>RAS</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>QUELQUES FAUTES GRAMMATICALES, SYNTAXIQUES ET D'ORTHOGRAPHE</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>RAS</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>RAS</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>RAS</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>RAS</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):**

Prendre en compte les suggestions portées dans le texte

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

-----  
Reviewer U:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The TITLE of manuscript is clear and adequate to the content.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

In the ABSTRACT they were objects, methods, and results.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The manuscript has few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The METHODS are not explained clearly. They have to bring more details

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of the manuscript is clear and does not contain errors.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The CONCLUSION can be improve.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The list of REFERENCES isn't enough comprehensive. can be improve

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

I propose to integrate some observations on the paper. Please try to improve the methods and the the results.

-----