



Paper: “Résistances sociales autour de la césarienne à Dimbokro (Côte d’Ivoire) : Le poids des déterminants socioculturels”

Submitted: 27 April 2025

Accepted: 21 November 2025

Published: 30 November 2025

Corresponding Author: Leh Bi Zanhon Guy Marcel

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n33p85

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Francis Tognon
University of Parakou, Republic of Benin

Reviewer 2: Akmelov Melessovsky
Ouattara University, Ivory Coast

Reviewer 3: Kouadio Mbra Kouakou Dieu-Donné
Université Alassane Ouattara, Bouaké, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 4: Ajavon Dédé Régine Diane
Université de Kara, Togo

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: AJAVON Dédé Régine Diane	
University/Country: Université de Kara/Togo	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/05/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/05/2025
Manuscript Title: Résistances sociales autour de la césarienne à Dimbokro (Côte-d'Ivoire) : Le poids des déterminants socioculturels	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0524/25	
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	
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] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. (Please insert your comments)	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Please insert your comments)	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Please insert your comments) Très peu de fautes à corriger	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly. (Please insert your comments) La méthodologie n'est pas rigoureuse.	3

<i>Il faut mieux détailler le déroulement de l'étude. Il y a un biais dans la sélection des enquêtés. Il n'y avait pas d'échantillonnage, la population d'étude était elle représentative de la population générale. Il est admis que les femmes qui bénéficient des césariennes d'urgence sont moins satisfaites que celles qui bénéficient d'une césarienne programmée. Ceci a un impact sur leur discours.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
(Please insert your comments) <i>Il manque l'enquête sur le personnel de santé sur le taux élevé des césariennes dans leur district et sur le poids des déterminants sociaux dans la réalisation des césariennes dans le district de Dimbroko</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
(Please insert your comments) Elle est générale Elle doit faire ressortir l'apport de l'étude sur la thématique	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
(Please insert your comments) <i>Retirer certaines références qui ne sont pas en rapport avec le thème</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):

Etude intéressante pour comprendre les facteurs qui influencent l'acceptabilité de la césarienne par nos populations. La réplique de l'étude dans une autre communauté permettrait de ressortir les facteurs en fonction des communautés

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Merci pour la collaboration

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: KOUADIO M'bra Kouakou Dieu-donné	
University/Country: Université Alassane Ouattara, Bouaké	
Date Manuscript Received: 14 Mai 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 23 Mai 2025
Manuscript Title: Résistances sociales autour de la césarienne à Dimbokro (Côte-d'Ivoire) : Le poids des déterminants socioculturels	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0524/25	
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:	

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] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>Le titre reflète effectivement le contenu.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>Les trois elements cites figurant dans le résumé. Toyetfois, la méthodologuie doit être rnefiorxcée. L'effectif de participants aux entretiens, la technique d'écgantillonnage sont absents de la méthodologie.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Le niveau de langue doit être rehaussé. Le texte est truffé d'erreurs multriformes, y compris des problèmes d'expresion. Il existe de longues phrases et plusieurs phrases mal bâties.</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>La méthodologie souffre de plusieurs insuffisances :</i> <i>Justifiez le choix de la zone d'étude avec des données pertinentes.</i> Vous devez préciser la/les techniques d'échantillonnage pour chaque catégorie d'acteur ainsi que le(s) critère(s) d'inclusion. En effet, comment s'est opéré le choix des 40 mères ? La tranche d'âge est précisée, mais elle n'est pas justifiée. Or, la sélection de toute tranche d'âge répond à des critères objectifs que ce soit de point de vue statistique, sanitaire, économique, etc. De plus, combien de mères de cette tranche d'âge ont-elles été dénombrées sur une période donnée dans une zone donnée (centre de santé, district sanitaire, etc.) Le choix de cette zone doit également obéir à des critères pertinents : S'il s'agit du district sanitaire, quelles sont les données qui justifient son choix au lieu d'un autre de la région sanitaire ? S'il s'agit d'un centre de santé, en quoi les données militent en faveur de sa sélection dans le district sanitaire ? Combien de mères ont-elles été recensées ? Expliquez clairement l'utilité de chaque technique d'échantillonnage ! Dans le cadre conceptuel, vous insistez sur la communauté Baoulé. Pourtant, rien ne nous indique ici que le critère ethnique a été retenu. Même si tel est le cas, vous devriez, au préalable, démontrer, à partir de statistiques sanitaires, que ce sont les femmes de cette communauté qui, le plus, optent pour le refus de la césarienne. Les considérations ne se limitent pas à ces aspects. Il s'agit de également de la liberté dont jouit l'enquête de répondre ou non à une partie ou à la totalité des questions. L'accord pour l'enregistrement des entretiens, les prises de vue ainsi que la sauvegarde de données, etc. font partie des principes éthiques.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Les résultats sont globalement bien présentés. Cependant, ils méritent d'être approfondis, surtout au niveau du calendrier de la grossesse chez les Baoulé, des phases qui la composent et de la thérapie appropriée à chacune de ces phases.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>En général, le résumé et la conclusion récapitulent le texte. Toutefois, certains points de la conclusion n'avaient été pris en compte dans les résultats.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Les références sont appropriées. Mais, elles doivent être harmonisées et actualisées.</i>	
8. Discussion	2
La discussion doit être structurée conformément à la logique d'exposition des résultats.	

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):

Prendre en compte l'ensemble des observations émises par l'instructeur. Il reste disponible pour les aider à améliorer la qualité du travail.

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: AKMEL Meless Siméon	
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 14/05/25	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/05/25
Manuscript Title: Résistances sociales autour de la césarienne à Dimbokro (Côte-d'Ivoire) : Le poids des déterminants socioculturels	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0524/25	
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] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. (Please insert your comments) Le titre est clair et original	3
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Please insert your comments) Les résultats ne sont pas mis en evidence	2
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Please insert your comments) Quelques problems de forme	3
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthodologie est longue, à réorganiser autour de: 1. Site de l'étude 2. Collecte et analyse des données	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Revoir la numérotation	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Acceptable	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Elle comporte trop de coquilles. A reprendre	

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: TOGNON Francis	
University/Country: University of Parakou: Republic of Benin	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 13 may 2025
Manuscript Title: Résistances sociales autour de la césarienne à Dimbokro (Côte-d'Ivoire) : Le poids des déterminants socioculturels Social resistance to cesarean in Dimbokro (Côte d'Ivoire): The weight of socio-cultural determinants	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0524/25	
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:	

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] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. (Please insert your comments) The title is clear and is adequate to the content of the article	5
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Please insert your comments) Authors must include the study period in the abstract.	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Please insert your comments)	3

Mistakes and errors are indicated in the text in revision mode	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study methods are good	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The results are clear and do not contain errors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusion is accurate and supported by the content	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The references are comprehensive and appropriate	

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):

The study period must be included in the summary, and any comments made in revision mode must be taken into account.