

Paper: “Evaluation de la Mise en Oeuvre des SONU dans le Département des Collines (Benin) en 2022”

Submitted: 01 February 2024

Accepted: 01 March 2024

Published: 31 March 2024

Corresponding Author: Joachim G. Aïfa

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n9p180](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n9p180)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jean Francois Regis Sindayihebura
Université du Burundi

Reviewer 2: Francis Tognon
University of Parakou, Republic of Benin

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: SINDAYIHEBURA Jean François Régis	
University/Country: Université du Burundi/BURUNDI	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/2/2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la Mise en Œuvre des SONU dans le Département des Collines (Benin) en 2022	
ESJ Manuscript Number: YES	
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:	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Oui, mais les auteurs doivent indiquer que l'étude est menée au Benin. Département des Collines ne suffit pas</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Oui, le résumé présente toutes ces parties, mais les auteurs le surchargent des détails qui doivent se retrouver dans la méthodologie, avec des passages du texte</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Oui.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Oui, mais les auteurs s'expriment parfois comme tous les lecteurs devront être du domaine de la santé. Parfois, il faut expliquer l'approche et donner les références</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les résultats sont clairs. Mais des lacunes méritent d'être soulignées :</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Parfois, les résultats spatialisables sont présentés dans un texte. D'où une carte présentant la zone d'étude est nécessaire</i> • <i>Les auteurs, en faisant référence aux figures et tableaux devaient le faire entre parenthèses</i> • <i>Les auteurs s'expriment dans un langage purement technique (les médicaments que les SONU devaient disposaient) sans que l'on ne trouve nulle part dans le texte une explication de leur importance. Les auteurs devaient s'y attacher : ou bien le faire dans l'introduction générale di texte, ou bien en introduisant ces résultats, tout en donnant les références</i> 	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>La conclusion telle qu'elle présente est un résumé des résultats seulement. Cependant, le résumé :</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Revient sur le contexte et l'objectif de l'étude</i> • <i>Résume la méthodologie</i> • <i>Cite les principaux résultats et donne leur implication socio-économique, politique, etc.</i> • <i>Propose brièvement les perspectives d'avenir</i> 	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3

(Please insert your comments)

Visiblement, les références sont bien présentées, mais il appartient à l'éditeur de vérifier si la norme qu'il propose est respectée.

Cependant, en lisant le document, le lecteur manquerait souvent des références.

Exemple : Les auteurs apprécient la qualité des SONU suivant l'échelle de mesure de Varkevisser. Mais, ils ne décrivent nulle part cette mesure et ne fournissent aucune référence

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):

Les auteurs tiendraient à réviser le document en tenant compte des commentaires sur cette fiche d'évaluation et ceux faits dans le document.

Généralement, une introduction d'article scientifique se fait en entonnoir, en allant du général au particulier. On insère généralement, un paragraphe de la revue de littérature, ce qui prépare une bonne discussion des résultats. Les auteurs n'y songent pas, d'où une discussion presque ratée.

La conclusion est à refaire.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: TOGNON TCHEGNONSI Francis	
University/Country: University of Parakou: Republic of Benin	
Date Manuscript Received: February 8 ^m	Date Review Report Submitted: February 25 ^m
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la mise en oeuvre des SONU dans le Département des Collines	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0221/24	
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.

<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>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The weak points are missing from the summary</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>There are a few small errors in revision mode</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Good method</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The results are clearly presented</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Summary and conclusion related to title and content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>References are good but few</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):

It's an interesting subject that takes stock of the evaluation of SONU in the Collines. It would be interesting to include the weaknesses in the summary, given that the strengths have already been mentioned..

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: