

Paper: “Troponine Ultra-sensible: Quelles Indications et Comment Interpréter les Résultats en Gériatrie Un Cas d'Élévation de la Troponine chez une Octogénaire”

Submitted: 23 December 2022

Accepted: 13 April 2023

Published: 30 April 2023

Corresponding Author: Youssoufa Seydou Moussa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n12p131

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Agulu Gilbert
Ghana Health Services, Ghana

Reviewer 3: Mahamadou Charfo
Cardiologie Chu Ibn Rochd Casablanca, Maroc

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: 13/3/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/3/2023
Manuscript Title: Ultra-sensitive troponin: what indications and how to interpret the results in geriatrics, A case of troponin elevation in an octogenarian	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
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.	5
<i>(The title was clear enough)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1

<i>(This did not present the objectives, methods and results sections in the abstract)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(The grammatical errors including spelling mistakes in this paper)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>(The study did not present any methodology)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(This study was a case study and only presented the case history and medical history of the patient. There was no results session in this paper)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(The conclusion was on point and depicts the topic and the summary of the study)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(The referencing was appropriate and comprehensive and related to the study)</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):

Authors have to restructure this paper to meet the ESJ standards. They need to provide more background information for this paper. The paper has no methodology, and results. Though it is a case study type of research, authors need to be meticulous and provide detail information on this research. There were grammatical errors and spellings mistakes too, that need to be corrected

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This paper is too superficial. For this paper to be considered for serious business, the authors should provide detail information especially on the abstract, background, justification, methodology and results sessions.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: CHARFO Bacharou Mahamadou	Email:
University/Country: Maroc	
Date Manuscript Received: 10 february	Date Review Report Submitted: 23 march
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	

<i>(the author apparently wants to discuss other non-cardiac causes of troponin elevations in a particular population, here elderly and multiple commorbidity)</i>	
5	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>(can be improved by following the 3 objective items methods and results)</i>	
4	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>(Case report)</i>	
4	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>consistency</i>	
5	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>()</i>	
5	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Troponin elevation in this geriatric population may be multifactorial and requires rigorous analysis to avoid missing an atypical form of ACS)</i>	
5	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

it would have been necessary to perform coronary angiography in this patient to rule out ACS in the presence of a troponin level >1000 because ischemia may be the cause of AF.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

A series of cases with their coronarography would be interesting.