

Paper: “Connaissances, Attitudes et Pratiques de la Dépigmentation Cosmétique Volontaire des Jeunes Filles en Milieu Scolaire et Universitaire du Département des Collines au Bénin”

Submitted: 16 February 2024

Accepted: 20 March 2024

Published: 31 March 2024

Corresponding Author: Ignace Tokpanoude

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n9p131

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Akmelov Melessovsky
Ouattara University, Ivory Coast

Reviewer 2: Ouattara Kalilou
Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny de Cocody, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Florian Lejuste Mpandi-Lucka
INS, Congo

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The sociodemographic characteristics of the girls are missing. This is an essential element for understanding the knowledge, attitudes and practices of the phenomenon studied.

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

Yes, there are grammatical and spelling errors on almost every page. It would be advisable to reread and make any corrections without distorting the existential, even if we have corrected a few errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

An interesting effort has been made to explain the method of the study.

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

Apart from spelling and grammatical errors, we have nothing to report in terms of content.

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

Any comments can be found in the document, where we have made a few minor corrections.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

good

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]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Any comments can be found in the document, where we have made a few minor corrections.

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: AKMEL Meless Siméon	
University/Country: Université Alassane Ouattara (Bouaké)	
Date Manuscript Received: 19/02/24	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/02/24
Manuscript Title: Connaissances, attitudes et pratiques de la dépigmentation cosmétique volontaire dans les lycées, collèges et universités du département des Collines au Bénin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 51284-1	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.

<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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Titre est clair	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résumé ne contient pas l'objectif de la recherche. Aussi, les résultats ne sont pas mis en évidence.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il existe des problèmes de forme. Trop de coquilles	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthodologie est claire, mais elle n'est pas numérotée.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
Il existe un problème d'organisation des idées. Les résultats ne cadrent pas avec les objectifs spécifiques énumérés dans l'introduction. Il en est de même de la discussion. A réorganiser.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Elle est sommaire. A revoir	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Riche, mais il existe un problème de présentation	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Voir les observations dans le texte.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: