

Manuscript: “Depistage De L’anemie En Urgence Au Chu Campus : Validation Du Degre De Concordance Entre Les Resultats De L’hemocue® Hb 301 Et Ceux Du Sysmex Xn-1000®”

Submitted: 05 October 2020

Accepted: 25 November 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding author: Kafui Codjo Kouassi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n33p355](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n33p355)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Nicolas Ayessou,
Université de Dakar (Sénégal)

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 18 th November 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 20th november 2020
<i>Manuscript Title: DEPISTAGE FIABLE DE L'ANEMIE AU SERVICE D'URGENCE BIOLOGIQUE DU CHU CAMPUS: ETUDE COMPARATIVE DU DOSAGE DE L'HEMOGLOBINEMIE SUR L'HEMOCUE® Hb 301 ET L'AUTOMATE SYSMEX XN-1000® / RELIABLE ANEMIA SCREENING AT THE BIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT OF CHU CAMPUS: COMPARATIVE STUDY OF HEMOGLOBINEMIA ASSAY ON HEMOCUE® Hb 301 AND SYSMEX XN-1000® ANALYZER</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1082/20	
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.	3
<i>(Le titre est clair mais il s'agit en réalité de la validation d'un nouvel outil de dosage par comparaison à un autre de référence. Les auteurs le dissent bien dans les objectifs au niveau de l'introduction. En ce sens, le titre pourrait être élaboré autrement</i> <i>lease insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Les erreurs d'orthographe sont surlignées en jaune	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(La démarche analytique puis de confirmation de la fidélité des deux outils sont bien menées et expliquées)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Le titre pourrait être amélioré pour être en évidence l'objectif réel de ce travail. Il s'agit bien d'une validation d'un outil par le biais d'une étude comparative et non une étude comparative en soi