

Paper: “Complications Electrolytiques. A Propos de 156 Colliges a la Clinique Universitaire d’Urologie Andrologie du CNHU – HKM de Cotonou”

Submitted: 17 August 2022

Accepted: 23 December 2022

Published: 31 December 2022

Corresponding Author: Juvenal Ngaguene

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p261](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p261)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tamou Sambo, Parakou/Bénin

Reviewer 2: Muhindo Valimungighe Moise

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: TAMOU SAMBO	
University/Country: Parakou/Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/9/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/9/22
Manuscript Title: Aspects Épidémiologiques, Diagnostiques, Thérapeutiques et Pronostiques des Troubles Électrolytiques. A Propos de 156 cas Colligés à la Clinique Universitaire d’Urologie et Andrologie du CNHU-HKM de Cotonou	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0905/22	
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/No	
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>(Le contenu est en rapport avec le titre)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>(respect du plan et résume bien le contenu de l'article) Ajouter l'écart-type à l'âge moyen</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<p>- Titre en anglais: <i>Urology and Andrology</i></p> <p>- Résultats et non résultats</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - En outre, l'ionogramme sanguin fait partie du bilan postopératoire certaines (il manque de entre postopératoire et certaines) - Les désordres électrolytiques le souvent rencontrés (le plus souvent) - Cette différence s'expliquerait par une iatrogénie surcharge sodée (de surcharge sodé) - consisteà (consiste à) prendre à (en) charge les troubles du rythme cardiaque immédiatement, secondola (secondo, la) recherche 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Préciser dans la méthodologie les taux sanguins des trois catégories de troubles électrolytiques: légère, modérée ou sévère)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - tableau1: les tranches des âges avec des crochets pour bien délimiter les intervalles - Laisser vide la première cellule en haut et à gauche des tableaux sauf pour le 3 - Figure 1: préciser le contenu de autres sous la figure - Préciser les signes cliniques pour les résultats du tableau2 - La légende de la figure 2 ne montre que 2 items, alors que le camembert a 3 couleurs - Figure3: les % sur le camembert - Tableau10: % des signes + est de 50% et non 36% - Les tableaux sont nombreux: fusionner certains ou faire des phrases pour des tableaux de moins de 4 entrées 	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Ces troubles sont souvent la conséquence des uropathies obstructives vues au stade de complications: l'article ne nous montre pas les étiologies des troubles pour pouvoir tirer cette conclusion)</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 23/09/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/09/2022
Manuscript Title: Aspects Épidémiologiques, Diagnostiques, Thérapeutiques et Pronostiques des Troubles Électrolytiques. A Propos de 156 cas Colligés à la Clinique Universitaire d'Urologie et Andrologie du CNHU-HKM de Cotonou	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0905/22	
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> LE TITRE EST A REFORMULER ET ADAPTER AU CONTENU	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> CONSIDERER LES REMARQUES	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> CORRIGER LES FAUTES	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> BONNE METHOLOGIE	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> A RETRAVAILLER	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> A ADAPTER AVEC LES RESULTATS	
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):

Bon article , Nous félicitons les auteurs et nous demandons de l'améliorer en suivant les remarques

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: