EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute
15 YEARS

Paper: **"Factors Associated with the Non-Use of Modern Contraception in the Djougou-Copargo-Ouaké Health Zone in 2024"**

**Submitted: 22 July 2025**
**Accepted: 30 September 2025**
**Published: 31 October 2025**

Corresponding Author: Tokpanoude C.N. Ignace

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n30p13

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Rozeta Shahinaj
Medical University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Elton Chavura
Mzuzu University, Malawi

**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:<br>Rozeta Shahinaj | |
| University/Country: Medical University of Tirana, Albania | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 04.08.2025 | Date Review Report Submitted: 13.08.2025 |
| Manuscript Title: Factors associated with the non-use of modern contraception in the Djougou-Copargo- Ouaké health zone in 2024 | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0814 | |
| 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<br>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***<br>[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] |
|---|---|
| **1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.** | **4** |
| The title accurately reflects the paper's theme. As the study analyzes the users and non-users of modern contraceptive methods, it's better to reflect this in the title. (e.g., "use and non-use" or "factors influencing use") | |
| **2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.** | **4** |
| The abstract is organized into: introduction, materials and methods, results, and conclusions. In the text should be mentioned briefly the sample size and data collection dates. | |
| **3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.** | **4** |

| | |
|---|---|
| There are minor grammatical errors throughout the text, including article usage and punctuation placement that need to be corrected. | |
| **4. The study methods are explained clearly.** | **3** |
| The study methods are explained clearly, but need some corrections.<br>The mention of the Djougou-Copargo-Ouaké health zone appears three times in the methods section; it would be better not to repeat it.<br>The distinction between “target population” and “source population” needs to be clarified.<br>The definition of "high" or "good" knowledge of MCMs is confusing.<br>It would be necessary to be more transparent about the participants who were excluded from the study. | |
| **5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.** | **4** |
| Generally, the results are clear. The section needs some improvements.<br>In Figure 3, the values are not aligned with their respective columns.<br>Table and figure captions must all be above the figure.<br>The tables and figures must be accompanied by more explanation of the results.<br>Use decimal formatting for the numbers in the tables. | |
| **6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.** | **4** |
| The conclusions of the study are accurate and supported by the content.<br>The conclusion must offer concrete recommendations for local health policy in order to improve the scientific contribution | |
| **7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.** | **3** |
| The references are appropriate for the article, but need to be reorganized in APA format. | |

**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):**

Although the content is informative and well-researched, consider refining sentence structure for better clarity and logical flow.
Minor grammatical and punctuation errors need to be corrected, such as inconsistent spacing before punctuation, subject-verb agreement, and article use.
Consider simplifying sentence structures and using more direct phrasing to improve accessibility.
In the abstract text should be mentioned briefly the sample size and data collection dates.
The study methods are explained clearly, but need some corrections.
The mention of the Djougou-Copargo-Ouaké health zone appears three times in the methods section; it would be better not to repeat it.
The distinction between “target population” and “source population” needs to be clarified.
The definition of "high" or "good" knowledge of MCMs is confusing.

It would be necessary to be more transparent about the participants who were excluded from the study.
Generally, the results are clear. The section needs some improvements.
In Figure 3, the values are not aligned with their respective columns.
Table and figure captions must all be above the figure.
The tables and figures must be accompanied by more explanation of the results.
Use decimal formatting for the numbers in the tables.
The conclusion must offer concrete recommendations for local health policy in order to improve the scientific contribution.
The references need to be reorganized in APA format.

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

---
Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

---
**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**
the title is clear
**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**
the abstract must be certainly revised. The methodolgy used is not properly explained. The results and recommendations are either not coming out clear or missing out completely. Comments have been made on the manuscript and authors can go back and re-do this section.
**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**
There are neglible errors, if any
**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**
This section is very weak. The authors have to do some good work here. This section has severely weakened the paper. Authors can refer to the review comments under this section.
**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**
This is fair
**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**
This section is poorly done. There are no recommendations. The section doesnt seem to answer the original research question. Refer to my comments
**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**
Acceptable
***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

***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]
4

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**
Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**
Good effort but revisions are required to make the paper strong. Based on the sample size and methodology used, these results may not be infered elsewhere?? certainly not… so its important to provide s disclaimer and justify why the study results can or cannot be replicated
---