

Manuscript: “**Evaluation De La Satisfaction Des Patientes Hospitalisées En Suites De Couches À La Maternité De L’hôpital De Bè (Togo)**”

Submitted: 05 February 2021

Accepted: 06 July 2021

Published: 31 August 2021

Corresponding Author: Ajavon Dédé Régine Diane

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n29p210

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kain Dantola Paul

Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: Bagny Aklesso

University of Lome, Togo

Reviewer 3: Achille Obossou

UER en gynécologie Obstétrique, Faculté de Médecine, Université de Parakou (Bénin)

Reviewer 4: Adamou Harissou, Niger

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: KAIN Dantola Paul	
University/Country: Ouagadougou/ Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/06/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/06/2021
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la satisfaction des patientes hospitalisées en suite de couches de l'hôpital de Bè	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0265/21	
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.	
<i>oui</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>oui</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>Il y a peu de fautes de grammaire et d'orthographe dans cet article. L'auteur pourra les corriger facilement</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>La méthodologie est bien faite Ajouter simplement que l'étude est aussi descriptive</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>Prendre en compte les suggestions faites dans le chapitre des resultats</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>oui</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>oui</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): Suggestions faites dans le corps du texte

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: BAGNY Aklesso	
University/Country: university of Lome/Togo	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/06/21	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/06/21
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la satisfaction des patientes hospitalisées en suites de couches l'hôpital de Bè	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0265/21	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Need few modification	

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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<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):

Article d'intérêt publique majeur pour amélioration des prestations de soins dans les hôpitaux, c'est un bon article qui peut être publié après quelques corrections mineures

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: 07 JUIN 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 24 JUIN 2021
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la satisfaction des patientes hospitalisées en suites de couches de l'hôpital de Bè	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0265/21	
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>(Please insert your comments)</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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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.	3
<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):

LES AUTEURS VONT PRENDRE EN COMPTE LES ELEMENTS DE CORRECTION SUGGEREES ET APPORTER LES CORRECTIONS ET MODIFICATIONS NECESSAIRES

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: ADAMOU Harissou	Email:
University/Country: Niger	
Date Manuscript Received: 25-06-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 11-07-2021
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la satisfaction des patientes hospitalisées en suites de couches de l'hôpital de Bè	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0265/21	
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
Evaluation de la satisfaction des patientes en suites de couches de l'hôpital de Bè <i>(supprimer hospitalisées)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>Voir le manuscript en mode révision</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Voir le manuscript en mode révision</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Voir le manuscript en mode révision</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>Voir le manuscript en mode révision</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Voir le manuscript en mode révision</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Voir le manuscript en mode révision</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):

Les auteurs de ce manuscrit : « Evaluation de la satisfaction des patientes hospitalisées en suites de couches de l'hôpital de Bè » , ont produit un travail de qualité. Je le félicite. Ces informations fournis dans ce document, méritent d'être partagées avec la littérature scientifique.

Des corrections et commentaires ont été fait dans le manuscrit afin d'améliorer le document.

Cordialement