

**Manuscript: “Cas D’une Fausse Fracture De La Verge Par Rupture De La Veine Dorsale Profonde Au Centre Hospitalo-Universitaire Departemental -Oueme Plateau De Porto Novo, Benin”**

**Submitted: 11 September 2021**

**Accepted: 06 December 2021**

**Published: 31 December 2021**

Corresponding Author: Dr Muhindo Valimungighe Moise

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n43p50

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Atade Raoul, Université de Parakou / Bénin

# ***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: 24 septembre 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 02 octobre 2021
Manuscript Title: <b>CAS D'UNE FAUSSE FRACTURE DE LA VERGE PAR RUPTURE DE LA VEINE DORSALE PROFONDE AU CENTRE HOSPITALO-UNIVERSITAIRE DEPARTEMENTAL -OUEME PLATEAU DE PORTO NOVO, BENIN</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 76.09.2021	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>results.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments) Quelques corrections à apporter au résumé (Voir le document )</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Nous avons note très peu d'erreurs gramaticales</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les références doivent etre reprises selon les normes APA</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):**

Sujet très interessant mettant en exergue le diagnostic différentiel d'une fracture de la verge. La chirurgie est utilisée comme moyen diagnostique et thérapeutique comme l'a si bien souligné l'auteur.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**