

**Paper: “Les Accidents Sur les Sites d’Orpillage Traditionnel : Un Danger Pour la Vision au Niger”**

**Submitted: 26 August 2021**

**Accepted: 27 March 2023**

**Published: 31 March 2023**

Corresponding Author: Manana Machitidze

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n9p253](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n9p253)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Rhissa Mahamane

Reviewer 2: Kossi Dzidzinyo  
Université de Lomé, Togo

# ***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: RHISSA MAHAMANE	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/ 11/ 21	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Apport de la tomographie en cohérence optique (OCT) dans le glaucome primitif à angle ouvert (GPAO) au Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0937	
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>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [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>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</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>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):**

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

# ***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: DZIDZINYO	
University/Country: Université de Lomé/Togo	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/01/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>Apport de la tomographie en cohérence optique (OCT) dans le glaucome primitif à angle ouvert (GPAO) au Niger</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 37.09.2021	
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>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)Il faudrait bien détailler votre methodologie surtout les critres d'inclusion et non inclusion. Cela donnerait de la force à votre travail</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</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>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):**

**Il faudrait relire posement tout le document et corriger les fautes**

**En general: on a l'impression de lire un memoire et non un article**

**Des phrases non bien dites qui deforment le sens ou nous prive de la bonne comprehension**

**Faites des phrases courtes pour expliquer vos propos.**

Preferer les crochet: [10-20]; [20-30]; [30-40[ etc...  
Idées et etude interessantes mais vous ne le vendez pas bien.  
Je vous suggere un comité de lecture avant soumission à un journal (les erreurs peuvent irriter l'editeur)

La methodologie doit etre bien explicité; notamment les criteres d'inclusion et non inclusion  
Vos definitions operationnels doivent etre annoncé dans la methodologie

Sortir les figures et tableaux du manuscript les mettre à la fin  
Respectez les norms internationaux pour la presentation des figures et tableaux

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