

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 23-12-16	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 28-12-16
Manuscript Title: DE LA TRADITHERAPIE AU CENTRE DE SOIN SPECIALISE DE L'ULCERE DE BURULI: IMPACT DES CANAUX D'INFORMATION SUR L'ITINERAIRE THERAPEUTIQUE DES MALADES ET LES REALITES DE L'HOSPITALISATION A DJEKANOU (COTE D'IVOIRE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:1285/16	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-lesspoint 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.	02
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> Itinéraires thérapeutiques des malades de l'UB et difficultés de prise en charge hospitalière	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	03
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> Pas de résultats	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	04
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	03
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	03
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	02
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	03
<i>(a brief explanationis recommendable)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Le titre doit être changé comme suggéré pour qu'il soit en adéquation avec le contenu. L'étude est en réalité qualitative et doit être analysée comme telle. Les pourcentages contenus dans le texte ne signifient pas grand-chose dès lors que la représentativité quantitative n'est pas justifiée. Il faut se situer dans une posture de découverte. S'interroger sur les facteurs explicatifs du choix des structure modernes de soins après les traitements traditionnels et s'en tenir à ce que disent les enquêtés.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: L'article doit être restructuré, le titre adapté au contenu et les analyses plus approfondies pour qu'il soit publié.

