

Manuscript: “Méningo-Encéphalite Herpétique Complicée D’un Syndrome De Klüver-Bucy: A Propos D’un Cas”

Submitted: 11 July 2020

Accepted: 30 September 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding author: Komi Ignéza Agbotsou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n30p164

Peer review:

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

Reviewer 2: Glorien Jemissair Lemahafaka Toliara/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: Dr AMANA Essobiziou	Email:
University/Country: université de Lomé-Togo	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/07/2020
Manuscript Title: Syndrome de Klüver-Bucy compliquant une méningoencéphalite herpétique à HSV1 : Cas clinique	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 81.07.2020	
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
<i>titre est-il informatif et pertinent?</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>1/L'objectif de l'étude nous semble moins clair vu que le syndrome est relativement fréquent</i>	

(la question de recherche n'est donc pas clairement définie ni justifiée sur la base de ce que l'on sait déjà sur le syndrome)	
2/Le resultat de la prise en charge du syndrome n'est pas clairement établi dans le résumé	
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.	3
<i>Vu que le syndrome est relativement frequent,dire ce qui a conduit à la selection du cas</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<p>introduction fait mention de ce que l'on sait déjà sur la méningo encéphalite alors que sa devrait être sur le syndrome ; ce qui fait que la question de recherche n'est pas aussi clairement définie et ce qui a motivé la sélection du cas non justifié</p> <p>figures pertinentes et clairement présentées</p> <p>Les résultats sont très bien discutés sous plusieurs angles et centré sur le syndrome sans être surinterprétés</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Vu que l'objectif de l'etude n'était pas clairement défini, la conclusion nous semble partiellement complète</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>références pertinentes et texte référencé correctement selon les règles du journal</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 suggestions en rapport avec le résumé et l'introduction
- revoir la conclusion

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: LEMAHAFKA J. Glorien	
University/Country: Toliara/Madagascar	
Date Manuscript Received: 24 Juillet 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/08/2020
Manuscript Title: Syndrome de Klüver-Bucy compliquant une méningoencéphalite herpétique à HSV1 : Cas clinique	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 81-07	
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.	2
<i>Description en 10 à 15 mots au maximum et de façon informative (et non déclarative) de l'intérêt de l'observation ou de l'objectif de la présentation et se terminant par « à propos d'un cas »</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	2

results.	
<i>Non structure</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Acceptable	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Il's'agit d'un cas Clinique, observation médicale</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>Des elements manquants</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>A reformuler</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5

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):

Lire la recommandation aux auteurs

Montrez votre article aux ainés pour la correction avant la soumission

Je vous envoie un modèle ou plan de rédaction d'un cas Clinique