



Paper: **“La Goutte : Aspects Cliniques Et Paracliniques”**

Corresponding Author: Kouassi Jean-Meremoze Djaha

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n21p142

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr AMANA Essobiziou, université de Lomé-Togo

Reviewer 2: Alexis do Santos Z. University of Abomey-Calavi (Republic of Benin)

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Published: 31.07.2020

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: : Dr AMANA Essobiziou	Email: :
University/Country: université de Lomé-Togo	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/06/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/06/2020
Manuscript Title: La Goutte : Aspects épidémiologiques, cliniques et paracliniques	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 50.06.2020	
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.	5
Le titre est clair, informatif et pertinent	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Résumé clair</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Voir le texte</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Préciser le logiciel de traitement de données</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>Clair</i> <i>Nous pensons que le tableau 2 n'est pas nécessaire vu que les facteurs qui y figurent sont tous mentionnés dans le texte...l'idéal est un tableau résumant les autres facteurs mioritaires</i> <i>Autres suggestions:,orienter les figures</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Claire, précise</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>References bien rédigées</i> <i>Voir la fiche " Lignes directrices à l'intention des auteurs" deuxième astérisque</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):

Revoir la fiche *Lignes directrices à l'intention des auteurs"*

Revoir suggestion pour le tableau 2 et les figures

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: do Santos Zounon Alexis	Email:
University/Country: University of Abomey-Calavi (Republic of Benin)	
Date Manuscript Received: June 19 th 2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: La Goutte : Aspects épidémiologiques, cliniques et paracliniques	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0650/2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

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
(Please insert your comments) You don't have all the points because the epidemiological aspects part was poor (this part should be removed from the title but retained in the text to describe your sample)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
(Please insert your comments)	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
Hypertension = High Blood Pressure	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Nous avons recensé 42 patients” should be removed from the method because it is a result • The ACR criteria (Table 1) should be in Method; it is not your result. • The title of table 1 should be : Criteria for gout diagnosis according to ACR (please mention “gout diagnosis” in the title) • The clinical data should be better organized. I suggest you 4 points : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Risk factors (high blood pressure; Obesity; Diabetes; Alcoholism; game consumption); ✓ Evolutionary form (acute; chronic: mention here the tophi); ✓ Number of joints affected (polyarticular, oligoarticular, monoarticular forms) ✓ Type of joint affected (knees, ankle, toes, other joints) 	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
All the results of your 42 patients should be given, not only the main results. For example you gave only the main risk factors instead of declaring all the risk factors found in your 42 patients. Other example: “Tophi were the most common chronic forms” which other chronic forms have you had in your sample? Readers need to know all your results found on your sample.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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)