ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **The interaction between the micro-insurances and the insured in the process of health care cover in Côte d'Ivoire**	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-lesspoint rating.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating) For decades, Côte d'Ivoire has been facing socio-economic crises that prevent people from meeting their health needs which are constantly growing. The issues of universal health care insurance have become a concern for the authorities. This title is therefore topical and clearly describes this state of affairs.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating) **The abstract is very well structured and makes clear the objectives of the study, the methodology as well as the findings.**	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**2**
(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating) **This text reveals some grammatical weaknesses, which weaknesses prevent the text from**	

enjoying its real value.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating) The methodology is clearly defined. However, it shows us the case of the rural insured. The results unveil their presence among the respondents. Do these percentages come from the interviews or rather from the data of the documentation?	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating) **The conclusion is significant. It indeed sums up the various issues addressed in the study.**	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating) **The references are good. The documents exploited are closely related to the subject.**	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	**X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The text seems to me very interesting. It deals with a topical subject in Côte d'Ivoire. For these reasons, you need to rid the text of some grammatical errors and some speech problems.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This is a very interesting and topical text. The remarks to the authors will definitely give to this article, the value that it truly deserves. So I give **my consent to the publication** of this paper with the inclusion of minor revisions.

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute