

---

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

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 report. 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. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. 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: 08/01/2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 08/01/2018
<b>Manuscript Title: PREVALENCE OF HEART FAILURE DURING PREGNANCY AND PUERPERIUM IN HOSPITAL SETTING IN PARAKOU IN 2015</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

## Evaluation Criteria:

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

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>It is about prevalence of heart failure as mentioned in the title</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>No comments about the abstract</i>	
<b>3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Paper is in French, without grammatical errors. <u>However improvement of the formatting of tables are needed</u></i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Method about how the investigation has been led is clear despite several important limitations which should be discuss in particular about the lack of biology marker and coronary angiography.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The content of the paper is clear and well illustrates.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Conclusion should mentioned the main result of the paper which is the description of the prevalence of heart failure with some cautions due to the large limitations of the paper.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.</b> <i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**European Scientific Journal**  
European Scientific Institute

