



Paper: “Gestion Des Dmards Conventionnels Dans La Polyarthrite Rhumatoïde Au Bénin : Quid De La Biothérapî”

Corresponding Author: Zavier Cossi Zomalheto

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n24p60

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Eyram Fianyo, Togo

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Dr. Larbre, Lyon, France

Published: 31.08.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: Fianyoy Eyrām | Email: |
| University/Country: Togo | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 26 juin 2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: |
| Manuscript Title: Gestion des DMARDs conventionnels dans la polyarthrite rhumatoïde au Bénin : Quid de la biothérapie | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0651/20 | |
| 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: No | |

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] |
|---|---|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 3 |
| <i>En lisant le titre de l'article nous avons pensé qu'il serait question de la place des biotherapies dans la gestion des DMARDS chez les patients souffrant de PR au Bénin. Dès l'objectif nous avons compris que les biotherapies ne feraient pas l'objet du travail</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and | 4 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| results. | |
| <i>Voir les commentaires dans l'article</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <i>Quelques erreurs mineures ont été surlignées dans l'article</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>Préciser le période d'étude, le respect ds critères éthiques, et détailler les critères d'exclusion</i> | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 3 |
| <i>Je propose de répondre à l'objectif de l'étude dans la discussion, et non d'attendre les dernières lignes de la conclusion</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 5 |
| | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 3 |
| <i>Voir les commentaires dans l'article</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | X |
| 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 2020

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: Dr LARBRE | |
| University/Country: Lyon, FRANCE | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 22-7-2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: 20-8-2020 |
| Manuscript Title: Gestion des DMARDs conventionnels dans la polyarthrite rhumatoïde au Bénin | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: | |
| 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] |
|--|--|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 2 |
| <i>In this cohort, no patient under biotherapy; the title should not mention biotherapy. Gestion des DMARDS conventionnels synthétiques dans la polyarthrite rhumatoïde au Bénin</i> | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |
| <i>Results have to be completed : percentage of patients who achieve remission under cs DMARDs, percentage of patients in remission under MTX, percentage of patients responders on MTX, percentage of patients who can stop corticotherapy thanks to MTX, description of adverse events and side effects due to MTX and csDMARDs, percentage of discontinuation of csDMARDs. Results of figure 2 about corticotherapy should be described in the text also.</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <i>Corrections are made in article I send back csDMARDs : DMARDs conventionnels synthétiques anti CCP : anti peptides cycliques citrullinés DAS 28 disease activity score Discussion ... nombre infime : écrire nombre très réduit de rhumatologues</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>Real life data about rheumatoid arthritis in Benin. Good article. The authors should compare their data with those of other African cohorts; for example : Ouedraogo DD et al, Rheumatoid arthritis in Burkina Faso ... Clin Rheumatol 2011; 30 : 1617-21. The authors should refer to studies about MTX : Salliot C, van der Heijde, Ann Rheum Dis 2009; 68 : 1100-4 // Lopez Olivo MA et al, Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2014</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- . mieux préciser les résultats en terme de corticothérapie; cf figure 2 : à 24 mois, nombre de patients toujours sous corticothérapie, quelle dose moyenne
- . mieux préciser les résultats sous MTX : efficacité, tolérance, effets indésirables, maintenance ; 21 patients ont arrêté MTX apparemment à 24 mois, expliquer....
- . les auteurs devraient évoquer en fin de discussion l'intérêt d'une étude multicentrique entre les rhumatologues d'Afrique de l'Ouest de leurs cas de polyarthrite rhumatoïde traités par csDMARDs

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: