

**Paper: “Perforations Tympaniques: Aspects Epidemiologiques et Etiologiques en  
Orl au Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Sylvanus Olympio de Lome au Togo”**

**Submitted: 24 August 2022**

**Accepted: 10 January 2023**

**Published: 31 January 2023**

Corresponding Author: Djim Hervey Reoulembaye

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n3p64](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n3p64)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Choua Ouchemi  
University of N'Djamena, Tchad

Reviewer 2: Elena Hunt  
Laurentian University, Canada

# 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. Elena Hunt	
University/Country: Université Laurentienne, Canada	
Date Manuscript Received: le 3 octobre	Date Review Report Submitted: le 10 octobre
Manuscript Title: Perforations Tympaniques: Aspects Epidémiologiques en Orl au Centre Hospitalier Sylvanus Olympio de Lome au Togo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 21.29.09.2022	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3-4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)Please conforming to APA</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Bonjour, merci de cette occasion de vous lire.

Veillez trouver mes suggestions et recommandations directement dans le fichier inclus. Mes ajouts ont été effectués à l'aide de la fonction 'Track changes' en Word.

**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!*

Reviewer Name: Pr CHOUA OUCHEMI	
University/Country: University of N'Djamena, Tchad	
Date Manuscript Received: October 3, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: October 5, 2022
Manuscript Title: Perforations Tympaniques: Aspects Epidemiologiques en OrL au Centre Hospitalies Sylvanus Olympio de Lome au Togo.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0929/22	
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	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>(The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The study methods are explained clearly.)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The results are clear and do not contain errors.)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The references are comprehensive and appropriate.)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Manuscrit bien rédigé, de lecture aisée. Le dernier paragraphe devrait être enrichi par les perspectives à la fin de cette étude.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**