

**Manuscript: “Etude Comparative des Techniques Chirurgicales dans la Chirurgie de la Cataracte au Niger”**

**Submitted: 12 April 2021**

**Accepted: 11 May 2021**

**Published: 31 May 2021**

Corresponding Author: Abba Kaka Yakoura

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n17p180

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Koutora Biréga, Université de Lomé, Togo

**Reviewer 2:** Moussa Mahamane Rhissa, Niger

# 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: <b>KOUTORA Biréga</b>	Email:
University/Country: <b>Université de Lomé / Togo</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>16 Avril 2021</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>18 Avril 2021</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>Etude comparative des techniques chirurgicales dans la chirurgie de la cataracte au Niger</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0474/21</b>	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Cf texte pour les observations</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Cf texte pour les observations</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Cf texte pour les observations</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>2,75</b>
<i>Cf texte pour les observations</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Cf texte pour les observations</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Cf texte pour les observations</i>	

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

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

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

# ***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 Rhissa	Email:
University/Country: Niger	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Etude comparative des techniques chirurgicales dans la chirurgie de la cataracte au Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0474	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>1,5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2,5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2,5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>1,5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Se conformer au style de ESJ</i>	

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

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

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