



Manuscript: “Mise en place du Projet de Gestion et de Soutien dans un Etablissement Public Hospitalier : cas de l’Hôpital du Mali”

Submitted: 29 May 2020

Accepted: 14 August 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding Author: Oumar Bah

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n28p213

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Traore Mohamed

Reviewer 2: Andrianarizaka Marc Tiana
University of Antananarivo, Madagascar

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.
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: TRAORE MOHAMED	Email:
University/Country: Mali	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Mise en place du Projet de Gestion et de Soutien dans un Etablissement Public Hospitalier : cas de l'Hôpital du Mali	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0655/20	
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.

<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>This title is clear and concise. It underlines the necessity to set up this project in Malian context.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Objects are clear, methods must be underlined in this abstract.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
This article is well written. However, the author should mention the different sources of the boards.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
Yes the study methods are clearly explained. However, the author should refer to the analogous studies carried out abroad.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
Only the slight error like hypotheses mentioned in this paper. They should be expressed affirmatively instead of in the interrogative forms.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	Acceded, minor revision needed
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It will be interesting to improve the number of the references

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 2020-06-01	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Mise en place du Projet de Gestion et de Soutien dans un Etablissement Public Hospitalier : cas de l'Hôpital du Mali	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0655/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.

<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>Globalement le titre de l'article est correct.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3,5
<i>Pas de commentaire</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3,5
<i>Quelques erreurs syntaxiques et grammaticales se sont glissées dans l'ouvrage.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1,5
<i>La méthodologie est très confuse et ne permet pas de définir ou de retrouver l'axe de la recherche. Bien nuancer, la méthodologie de collectes des informations et la méthodologie de traitement des données recueillies ainsi que la démarche de validation des hypothèses.</i> <i>Les hypothèses sont mal formulées. En aucun cas, les hypothèses d'étude ne se formulent jamais sous forme de question et leur nombre ne doit pas dépasser de trois (3) surtout dans un article.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	1,5
<i>La présentation de l'étude est assez désordonnée. L'axe de la recherche doit être facile à identifier. L'article est un peu volumineux. L'article prend un style narratif. Des analyses exploratoire, confirmatoires et explicatives sont absentes dans l'ouvrage.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>Le résumé doit être établi en un seul paragraphe et met en évidence l'objet et la finalité de la recherche et éventuellement fournir un aperçu de la pratique méthodologique adoptée.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>En général correct.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

D'une manière générale, l'aspect scientifique doit être mis en exergue dans la rédaction de votre article. L'utilisation des techniques de recherches et d'analyses scientifiques avancées (utilisant les logiciels connus dans la recherche dans le domaine de la gestion et du management) des données issues de vos recherches serait un atout majeur pour donner la qualité scientifique de votre travail.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: