



**Paper: “Connaissance des parents sur les effets des écrans chez les enfants de zéro à cinq ans du Centre Hospitalier Régional de Daloa (Centre-Ouest de la Côte d’Ivoire)”**

**Submitted: 07 August 2024**

**Accepted: 12 March 2025**

**Published: 31 March 2025**

Corresponding Author: Crystel Natacha Bohoussou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n9p170

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Francis Midima Bararmna-Bagou  
Université de Lomé, Togo

Reviewer 2: Blinded

# 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: Francis Midima BARARMNA-BAGOU	
University/Country: Université de Lomé/ Togo	
Date Manuscript Received: 19/11/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 30/11/2024
Manuscript Title: Connaissance des parents sur les effets des écrans chez les enfants de zéro à cinq ans du Centre Hospitalier Régional de Daloa (Centre-Ouest de la Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1210/24	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
-----------	--

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	
<i>Objects is to describe, methods are not explained</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
Use the past tense, sentence in figure 1 not included, characteristics, knowledge.... of the respondents and not parents of the children surveyed	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Study type not specified, recruitment unclear, variables not defined, data collection method not defined, ethical part absent, data analysis plan not specified</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Too many figures and some badly used (2, 6, 7, 8 and 12) where we have only 2 modalities, so prefer one sentence.</i> <i>Table title above the table</i> <i>In a table, units of measure (%) should not be included in the body of the table</i> <i>The stump must be empty</i> <i>Numbers must be aligned under the decimal separator</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>References 1 and 2 have no title</i>	