

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 team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 7 / 7 / 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 14 / 7 / 2017
Manuscript Title: La Hernie ombilicale étranglée de l'enfant: aspect épidémiologiques cliniques et thérapeutiques au centre hospitalier régional de Ziguinchor (Sénégal)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 76.07.2017	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>The title can be shorter than this "Hernies ombilicales étranglées de l'enfant au centre hospitalier regional de Ziguinchor (Sénégal)"</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>The abstract present objects, methods and results, but is not structured. The key words are not well selected</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>There are a lot of grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in the article. There are also a lot of words, expressions and sentence without precision.</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>There is no detail for studied parameters. Criteria of diagnosis of strangulated umbilical hernia are not described</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>Some References are incomplete, others are not well presented. Many references are not well cited in the text</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Authors must use more precisions, clearness and concision. References are not well used most of the time. Some affirmations are without reference. Some references are placed together in the same bracket and the reader cannot know which reference is for which author. Example: “Ces chiffres restent très élevés **parraport** à l’étude de Ngom où un seul cas de suppuration pariétale a été noté alors que dans le travail de Fall on notait une suppuration pariétale chez deux patients [4, 5] “

Some sentences are too long.

Result must be presented in past tense. Some result appears in the discussion, and

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No comments or suggestion

