

Paper: “Les Lésions en Endoscopies Digestives Hautes à Bangui”

Submitted: 20 August 2022

Accepted: 18 October 2022

Published: 31 October 2022

Corresponding Author: Youssouff Youssouff

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n33p182](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n33p182)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tape Bi Sehi Antoine

Reviewer 2: Salam Ouedraogo

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Dr TAPE Bi Sehi Antoine	
University/Country: Peleforo Gon Coulibaly University (Ivory Coast)	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/10/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/10/2022
Manuscript Title: Les anomalies en endoscopies digestives hautes à Bangui	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 17.09.2022	
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.	5
<i>The author has remained consistent and in harmony with both the title and content of his work</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Yes, however, the author will have to restructure the text of the summary. The</i>	

<i>indications given may help him/her to do so.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Just the tense of the verbs in its use. The past tense should have been used in several situations</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Please insert Good methodology but insufficient. The sampling technique is not clearly defined and the statistical units are not known. your comments</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are clear</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>okay</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>In the body of the document, the page numbers of the documents consulted are not indicated. This should be known because some authors do not actually read the documents they refer to.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Good study both in its approach and in its results. With a view to improving the work, the author should take into account the observations made in the document.

Bonne étude tant dans sa démarche qu'au niveau des résultats. Dans l'optique de l'amélioration de travail, l'auteur devra prendre en compte les observations émises dans le document.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: OUEDRAOGO Salam	
University/Country: University of Ouahigouya/Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received:05/10/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/10/2022
Manuscript Title: Les anomalies en endoscopies digestives hautes à Bangui	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0917/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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.	2
<i>(Endoscopic lesions would be more indicated than anomalies: Pathological modification of a tissue, a cell)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(The summary is long. The objective is not clearly stated. Results Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

<i>(Little fault. But the time used for writing is not appropriate. the past tense would be desirables)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>((Elements are missing in the study method: mode of data collection, variables, types of classifications used for lesions))</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(The results are not announced. The chi2 test was not used as stated in the method))</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>((The conclusion is not supported by the Chi2 test.)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>((54% of references are more than 10 years old.)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I have brought some proposals that the author can take into account

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: