

Manuscript: “**Effet des Perturbations Électriques sur les Appareils de Radiologie À Rayons X À Haute Fréquence (HF) Alimentés par le Réseau Électrique Camerounais: Cas des Coupures D’Énergie**”

Submitted: 02 March 2021

Accepted: 04 October 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Docta Basile Kpalang

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p156](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p156)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Daniel Tchiotsop

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

Daniel Tchiotsop

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2021-08-06 11:20 AM

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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.

***I think the title of the paper fits well with its content**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

***The abstract perfectly represents the entire paper**

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

Not enough

The study **METHODS** are explained clearly.

***yes**

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

***Yes, but the authors must add the organization of the rest of the article at the end of the introduction**

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

***yes**

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

***yes**

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

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):

I appreciate the authors' initiative on this topical issue in third world countries.

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.

***Yes**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

***yes**

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

No

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

***Yes**

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

***Yes**

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

* yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

***Yes**

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

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):

I read with a very great interest this article.

However, the problem detected is not new. For this reason, the authors will have to provide proposals for concrete solutions to this problem for improving living conditions. This will add more value to this work.