

Paper: “Aspects Épidémiologiques, et Cliniques des Ascites de Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de l’Amitié Sino-Centrafricaine de Bangui, République Centrafricaine”

Submitted: 27 December 2022

Accepted: 03 February 2023

Published: 28 February 2023

Corresponding Author: Oumarou Uoussouf

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n6p21

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kambire Jean Luc
Université de Ouahigouya, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: Silla Semballa
Université de Bangui, République Centrafricaine

Reviewer 3: Kogoe Roland
University of Bangui Central African Republic

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!

	Email:
University/Country: Université de Bangui, République Centrafricaine	
Date Manuscript Received: 09 01 2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Aspects épidémiologiques, cliniques des ascites au CHUSC de Bangui	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0120/23	
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>Le titre est clair et concorde avec le contenu mais il faut ajouter les aspects étiologiques et ne doit contenir une abréviation non internationalement connue.</i>	

<i>Elle se retrouver dans le texte. Reformuler comme suit : « Aspects épidémiologique, cliniques et étiologiques des ascites au CUH (ou Centre Hospitalier Universitaire) de l'Amitié Sino- Centrafricaine de Bangui, (Centrafrique)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>L'objectif, la méthode et les résultats résument bien le travail mais ne doit pas reprendre la plupart des détails. Un effort doit être fait dans la formulation des phrases</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Il y a beaucoup de fautes d'orthographe et d'accord.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>La méthodologie comporte des insuffisances.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Les résultats sont clairs mais mal présentés. Certains ne sont pas nécessaires pour l'étude.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>La discussion et la conclusion sont à reprendre.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Les références sont compréhensibles et appropriées mais sont insuffisants si bien que la plupart de la discussion est avec 4 ou 5 auteurs. Elles sont à reprendre et à compléter car les règles ne sont pas respectées.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Sujet très important dans nos pays pauvres car la majorité des patients consultent à ce stade évolutif tardifs des complications des pathologies responsables.

Reprendre le travail en tenant compte des observations et surtout des propositions faites et resoumettre.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Sujet de médecine interne ou d'Hépatogastroentérologie très important.

Travail fait dans la précipitation. Les auteurs doivent le reprendre et le resoumettre avant l'acceptation.

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: semballa silla	
University/Country: University of Bangui Central African Republic	
Date Manuscript Received: 21 -01 - 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 29 – 01- 2023
Manuscript Title: Aspects épidémiologiques cliniques des ascites au CHUSC de Bangui Clinical and epidemiological aspects of ascites at the CHUSC of Bangui	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0120/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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>	
Aspects épidémiologiques et cliniques des ascites au CHUSC de Bangui	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
yes	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
yes	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
yes	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
yes	

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):

Revoir les quelques fautes de syntaxe dans le texte