

Manuscript: “**Bilan D’activités De 10 Ans De Pratique D’endoscopie Urologique Au Niger : Résultats, Défis Et Perspectives**”

Submitted: 03 March 2022

Accepted: 23 April 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Halidou Maazou

Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n14p212

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Muhindo Valimungighe Moise

Reviewer 2: Elena Hunt, Canada

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: MUHINDO VALIMUNGIGHE Moise	
University/Country: UNIVERSITE CATHOLIQUE DU GRABEN /RDC	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/03/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/03/2022
Manuscript Title: Bilan d'activités de 10 ans de pratique d'endoscopie urologique au Niger. Résultats, défis et perspectives	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0339/22	
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> Clair, précis et concis	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comment)</i>	
Il faut tenir compte des consignes aux auteurs	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Il faut tenir compte des corrections dans le texte	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Bonne methodologie mais il faut ajouter un paragraphe sur les considerations éthiques	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les resultats sont bien présentés mais il faut ajouter quelques données qui manquent dans le texte	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Bonne conclusion mais il faut enlever un paragraphe en jaune dans le texte	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Tres bien redigées	

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):

L'auteur ou les auteurs devront tenir compte des remarques incluses dans le texte pour améliorer l'article

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Elena Hunt	
University/Country: Laurentian University, Canada	
Date Manuscript Received: April 14	Date Review Report Submitted: April 21, 2022
Manuscript Title: Bilan d'activités de 10 ans de pratique d'endoscopie urologique au Niger : Résultats, défis et perspectives	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 033922	
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.	3
<i>Veillez remarquer les changements proposés directement dans le texte. Par ailleurs, l'article présente les résultats et les défis, mais beaucoup moins les perspectives....</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<p><i>Veillez remarquer les changements proposés directement dans le texte.</i></p> <p><i>Le niveau linguistique est plutôt médiocre. Il y a de nombreuses erreurs grammaticales, de syntaxe, d'orthographe et d'expression écrite. De plus, les consignes APA ne sont pas souvent respectées.</i></p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Une explication est nécessaire. Veillez remarquer le commentaire dans le texte.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<p><i>La rédaction des références doit suivre les consignes APA.</i></p> <p><i>Peu de références sont récentes, probablement il n'y en a pas beaucoup.....Si c'est le cas il faudrait mentionner ce fait dans le texte.</i></p>	

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):

J'aimerais voir cet article publié suite aux changements et correctifs proposés. Malgré que je ne considère pas une révision

majeure, il y a beaucoup de modifications et ajouts mineurs à apporter. L'article est important, bien structuré et facile à comprendre. Il devrait peut-être contenir des recommandations claires aux instances concernés, afin d'améliorer le système de santé en urologie au Niger.

Merci de m'avoir donné l'occasion de vous lire.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: