

Manuscript: “**Tuberculose pulmonaire en milieu carcéral au Niger : aspects épidémiologiques, diagnostiques, thérapeutiques et évolutifs**”

Submitted: 04 November 2020

Accepted: 23 March 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Kadri Sani

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n14p41

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: El Ghazi Ibrahim, Maroc

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: EL GHAZI Ibrahim	Email:
University/Country: Maroc	
Date Manuscript Received: 8-02-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 13-02-2021
Manuscript Title: Tuberculose pulmonaire en milieu carcéral au Niger : aspects épidémiologiques, diagnostiques, thérapeutiques et évolutifs	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 120.11.2020	
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.	2,5
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2,5
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2,5

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2,5
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
If faut retravailler les références	

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):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

À fournir encore d'effort en vous référant aux remarques et recommandations consignées dans le texte.

(2) Changes which must be made before publication