

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!

Date Manuscript Received:10/09/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:12/09/2012
Manuscript Title: RÉSULTATS DE LA CURE D'ÉVENTRATION PAR PROTHÈSE EN RETRO-MUSCULAIRE PRÉ-FASCIAL À OUAGADOUGOU, BURKINA FASO	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0983/17	

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.	2
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable) The title speaks about a surgical technique evaluation and the manuscript gives a description of this technique. The evaluation of the technique is not developed in the manuscript.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable) it summarizes well the manuscript with its errors</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable) There are some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable) the type of study is not clear. Basicly, the evaluation is based</i>	

<i>on criteria and scales. The number of patients doesn't permit to do conclusion</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)The 2/3 of results doesn't speak about results of evaluation. the patient population is not high enough to draw conclusions from an evaluation</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable) the conclusion is not related to the title and the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable) not actual and some are writ with mistakes</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):

The main problems of this manuscript are: low enrollment, absence of clear criteria and evaluation score, inaccurate methodology and results combined with methodology and obsolete references.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

