

Manuscript: “**Place De La Médecine Alternative Et Complémentaire Chez Les Patients Gonarthrosiques, À Propos De 105 Cas Au Congo Brazzaville**”

Submitted: 20 August 2020

Accepted: 25 December 2020

Published: 31 January 2020

Corresponding Author: Dr. Romaric Angalla

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n3p51

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: AKMEL Meless Siméon,
Université Alassane Ouattara (Bouaké-Côte d’Ivoire)

Reviewer 2: Banfitebiyi Gambogou,
University of Lomé, Togo

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: AKMEL Meless Siméon	
University/Country: Université Alassane Ouattara (Bouaké-Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 09/09/20	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/09/20
Manuscript Title: Place de la médecine alternative et complémentaire chez les patients gonarthrosiques au Congo - Brazzaville (à propos de 105 cas)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0919/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre est clair	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résumé est clair	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Relire le document	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthodologie est bien explicitée	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> L'introduction pose problème. Pas de questions de recherche, d'objectifs spécifiques, d'hypothèses, de thèse	
6. conclusion	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Conclusion à renforcer	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Références assez-bien présentées	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Les remarques importantes n'ont pas été prises en compte. Voir la correction.
Retourner le document pour vérification.



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: GAMBOGOU Banfitebiyi	
University/Country: University of Lomé/Togo	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/09/2020
Manuscript Title: Place de la médecine alternative et complémentaire chez les patients gonarthrosiques au Congo - Brazzaville	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0919/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/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.	4
<i>The title is clear and comprehensive</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract is clear but some adjustment needs to make it clear. See my recommendations in the manuscript.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Overall fine but some few grammar error has been detected (See my recommendations in the manuscript.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methodology has been well explained however for clarity the author should add subtitles separating the activities in the methodology.</i>	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>The text is correct no suggestion about this</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusion is clear and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The author should review the syntax of the author citation when the author is involved in the sentence. (Author et al., (Year yyyy)).</i> <i>The bibliographic research is insufficient and lacks recent references dating less than 5 years.</i> <i>However, the references used are appropriate for the study.</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):

My suggestions and comments are in the manuscript.