

Manuscript: “**Les Syndromes Drépanocytaires Majeurs Chez L’enfant et L’adolescent: Étude de la Cohorte du Centre Hospitalier Régional de Saint-Louis (Sénégal)**”

**Submitted: 229 July 2021**

**Accepted: 13 September 2021**

**Published: 31 August 2021**

Corresponding Author: Ndiogou Seck

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p70

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Donthy Kouakoubah Richard Kouakou, Unité de Formation et de Recherche Sciences de la Nature, Université Nangui Abrogoua, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

**Reviewer 2:** Stoyan Papanov, Université médicale Plovdiv, Faculté de pharmacie, Département de pharmacognosie et de la chimie pharmaceutique, Bulgarie

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Good

Review the translation of the title in English

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Good

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

*(Please insert your comments)*

Good

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Good

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Good

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Good

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.  
(Please insert your comments)

Make the references consistent with those in the journal

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

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

Please follow the journal's guidelines

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The title is formulated in detail and in accordance with the content of the work.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The abstract abbreviated but accurately presents the content of the article.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

*(Please insert your comments)*

There are no significant spelling and grammatical errors in the work.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The methods are formulated precisely and clearly.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The body comprehensively reflects the affected problem.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The conclusions are made on the basis of the content of the work.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The citations in the text are included in the list of references.

**Please rate the TITLE of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the METHODS of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the BODY of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

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