

Manuscript: **“Prise en Charge de la Grossesse Extra-Utérine en Situation d’Urgence : Expérience d’un Hôpital Confessionnel en Zone Rurale au Togo”**

Submitted: 08 February 2021

Accepted: 31 March 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Biréga Koutora

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n14p237

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Obossou Awadé A. Achille, UER en gynécologie Obstétrique, Faculté de Médecine, Université de Parakou, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Koffi Nagbé Massogblé Kodjo, University of Lomé, Togo

Reviewer 3: Bendari Mounia, Mohamed VI university of sciences and health, Morocco

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 09/02/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 17 Février 2021
Manuscript Title: <i>Prise en Charge de la Grossesse Extra-Utérine en Situation d'Urgence : Expérience d'un Hôpital Confessionnel en Zone Rurale au Togo</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0273/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.	4
<i>la formulation est bonne</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<p>Le nombre de sujets statistique de l'étude est de 28 L'idéal est d'atteindre 30 cas, pour une validité des résultats puis que l'étude s'est etendue sur 13 mois Il faut reorganiser les résultats</p>	
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):

Nous vous recommandons d'atteindre 30 cas de GEU pour une validité des résultats et veuillez revoir l'organisation des résultats

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: KOFFI Nagbé Massogblé Kodjo	
University/Country: University of Lomé/TOGO	
Date Manuscript Received: March 20, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Prise en Charge de la Grossesse Extra-Utérine en Situation d’Urgence : Expérience d’un Hôpital Confessionnel en Zone Rurale au Togo	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> yes, the title is adequate with the content of the article	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, the abstract is accurate	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> it is necessary to explain why in the methods it is the abdominal ultrasound you used and not the endocavitary ultrasound	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> in Table I, the site of the ectopic pregnancy should not be included in the epidemiological summaries	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> the conclusion is perfect	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The references are comprehensive and appropriate	

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):

The work is very interesting, but there is a small correction in table I to be made in the results, and there is a clarification to be made in the methods about using abdominal ultrasound instead of endocavity ultrasound

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: BENDARI MOUNIA	
University/Country: Mohamed VI university of sciences and health, Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 22/03/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/03/2021
Manuscript Title: <i>Prise en Charge de la Grossesse Extra-Utérine en Situation d’Urgence : Expérience d’un Hôpital Confessionnel en Zone Rurale au Togo</i>	
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.	4
The title is clear	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>yes</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Typing errors exist they must be corrected	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>yes</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>yes</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>yes</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>yes</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):

This article can be published, however, some minor correction are needed:

- 1- in this sentence (Les patientes sortaient de l'hôpital sous anti-anémique et méthode contraceptive ; et étaient suivies en contrôles) authors have to explain what treatment patients received for anemia.
- 2- (La transfusion de produits sanguins était faite chez 19 patientes (67,8%).) how many blood bag patients need (the mean number)