



Paper: “Analyse de l’efficacité du policy-mix face à la crise sanitaire : un modèle théorique appliqué à l’UEMOA”

Submitted: 16 November 2024

Accepted: 17 February 2025

Published: 28 February 2025

Corresponding Author: Kouakou Thiédjé Gaudens-Omer

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n4p188

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oumar Bah
Sup’ Management, Mali

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: Dr Oumar BAH Maître Assistant du CAMES	
University/Country: Sup'Management - Mali	
Date Manuscript Received: 29/01/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/01/2025
Manuscript Title: Analyse de l'efficacité du policy-mix face à la crise sanitaire : un modèle théorique appliqué à l'UEMOA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 29012025	
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>Le titre est clair et en adéquation avec le contenu du papier.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>Le résumé présente les objets, méthodes et résultats de la recherche.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Le papier ne contient pas beaucoup de fautes d'orthographe ni de grammaire.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>La méthodologie est bien clarifiée dans le papier.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Les résultats sont clairs et ne contiennent pas d'erreurs. Les formules sont bien assimilées par l'auteur</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>La conclusion et le résumé sont bien à propos.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>La bibliographie est adaptée</i>	

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):

Le papier est bien fait, mais tous les auteurs mobilisés dans le corps papier ne sont pas tous présents dans la bibliographie.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Ce papier peut être publié à ESJ .