

Manuscript: “**Complications des Mastites Puerpérales: Aspects Cliniques et Thérapeutiques dans un Hôpital de Zone Rurale au Togo**”

Submitted: 29 July 2021

Accepted: 13 September 2021

Published: 31 August 2021

Corresponding Author: Biréga Koutora

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p86

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tenete Assiaham Walawita, Université de Lomé, Togo

Reviewer 2: Bararmna-Bagou Francis Midima, Togo

Reviewer 3: Atade Raoul, Université de Parakou, Bénin

Reviewer 4: Ajavon D.R.D., Département de Gynécologie obstétrique, Université de Kara

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: TENETE Assiahm Walawita	
University/Country: Université de Lomé/Togo	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/08/2021
Manuscript Title: Complications des Mastites Puerpérales: Aspects Cliniques et Thérapeutiques dans un Hopital de Zone Rurale au Togo.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0831/21	
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: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	

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.	4

<i>Nous donnons cette note parce que le titre est conforme au contenu de l'article, surtout quant à ce qui concerne la situation de l'hôpital et le traitement médicamenteux qui se base sur une antibiothérapie probabiliste spécifique des hôpitaux en zone rurale</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Le résumé présente bien le but de l'étude, la méthodologie et les résultats.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Les fautes de grammaire et de vocabulaire sont quasi inexistantes néanmoins nous avons noté une omission de certains déterminants dans l'Introduction du document notamment au niveau de la quatrième phrase (.....complications comme l'abcès, la cellulite et la fasciite nécrosante du sein)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>La méthodologie est Claire</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Les résultats sont correctes et bien présentés</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>La conclusion et le résumé sont bien faits et resument bien l'article</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Les références sont adaptées de part leur contenu et assez récentes</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dans votre conclusion le volet preventif de la mastite puerperale n'est pas exhaustif; il consiste également à inhiber la production lactée chez les accouchées ayant perdu leur nouveau nés ou ayant eu des avortements tardifs par différentes méthodes et l'hygiène du mamelon avant et après chaque allaitement entre autre.

Dans la prise en charge, la greffe autologue nécessite une main entraînée ou un chirurgien plasticien; dans notre pratique nous avons obtenu une régénérescence spontanée de la peau du sein quoique tardive dèsfois.

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: BARARMNA-BAGOU Francis Midima	
University/Country:Togo	
Date Manuscript Received:6/09/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 8/09/2021
Manuscript Title: Complications des Mastites puérpérales: aspects diagnostics et thérapeutiques dans un Hôpital de zone rurale au Togo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0831/21	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<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	Yes
Accepted, minor revision needed	No
Return for major revision and resubmission	No
Reject	No

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: ATADE	
University/Country: Université de Parakou/ Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 6 Septembre 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 08 Septembre 2021
Manuscript Title: Complications des Mastites Puerpérales : Aspects cliniques et Thérapeutiques dans un Hôpital de Zone Rurale au Togo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 31.08.2021	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Il faut compléter les aspects évolutifs et préciser l'hôpital dans lequel l'étude a été réalisée</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)l'abstract doit etre débutée par une introduction</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)Nous avons noté très peu d'erreurs grammaticales</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthode doit etre revue en précisant les critères d'exclusion s'il y en a , le mode de recrutement des patients ,l'échantillonnage , l'utilisation ou non d'une fiche d'enquete pour collecter les variables etc...	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) La rubrique manque de chiffres et de precisions. Certaines données sont exposées dans la discussion alors que les résultats n'en parent pas.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Il s'agit d'un sujet très interessant qui met en exergue les réalités africaines en matière de pathologies mammaires puerpérales. L'auteur devra apporté plus de precisions

dans la méthodologie, des chiffres et pourcentages dans les résultats pour parfaire son manuscrit

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 6/09/21	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/09/21
Manuscript Title: complications des mastites puerpérales : aspects cliniques et thérapeutiques dans un hopital de zone rurale au Togo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0831/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No: 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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>Some corrections to be made</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>See comments</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>See comments</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Enrich the references and correct them</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Relevant subject very little developed in the literature. Thank you for thinking about it