

Manuscript: “**Rhabdomyosarcome de l’iliopsoas : Localisation Exceptionnelle Chez une Femme de 65 Ans**”

Submitted: 09 December 2020

Accepted: 05 March 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Viwalé Etonam Sika Koffi-Tessio

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n14p64

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Moussa Mahamane Rhissa, Service d’Odonto-stomatologie, Hôpital National de Niamey, Niger

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: MOUSSA MAHAMANE	
University/Country: Niger University	
Date Manuscript Received: 26/01/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Rhabdomyosarcome de l'iliopectineo : localisation exceptionnelle chez une femme de 65 ans	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 95 12 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. <i>Le titre est bien lisible est adapté au corps du sujet</i>	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. <i>Bien que c'est un cas Clinique , il comporte toutes les parties souhaitées dans un article</i>	3
3. Moins de fautes et erreurs grammaticales <i>Corriger les suggestions faites dans le texte</i>	4

4. Bien expliqué	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Cas Clinique informatif</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Références bien faites, mais il faut s'accomoder avec les exigences de ESJ</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): Prenez le soin de corriger pour une meilleure amelioration de l'article