

**Paper: “Les Actions en Responsabilité Médicale Pour Faute de Diagnostic:
Aspects de Droit Comparé Français et Ivoirien”**

Submitted: 10 December 2022

Accepted: 22 September 2023

Published: 30 September 2023

Corresponding Author: Jean Paul Agbodo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n26p30](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n26p30)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Juvenal Ngaguene
Université d’Abomey Calavi, Benin

Reviewer 2: Tolotry Ny Avo Saraha Njatomalala
University of Antananarivo, Madagascar

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: NJATOMALALA T.N.A.S.	
University/Country: University of Antananarivo, Madagascar	
Date Manuscript Received: 17 mars 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 29 mars 2023
Manuscript Title: Les actions en responsabilité médicale pour faute de diagnostic. Aspects de droit comparé français et ivoirien	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1680092656412_1679330078974_---40.12.2022---new version---	
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.	5
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>There are some minor grammatical errors to consider in this article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>it would be more explicit and easier to understand to distinguish in the text, at each quotation, what is happening in France and then in Côte d'Ivoire.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>it would be more explicit to set the conclusion apart and insist on the personal interests of the patient, the benefits of the family as well as those society if these "faults" will be more considered.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<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):

- this article remains interesting, especially in contexts in Africa and for doctors practicing there.
- would it be possible to add in the text examples showing the direct consequences linked to the negligence of these facts in Côte d'Ivoire. This could show the corresponding authorities and perpetrators the seriousness of their act (doctors, hospitals, legal authorities).

- in the discussions, could you add realistic suggestions for the Côte d'Ivoire, in parallel with what exists in France.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

we thank you for the honor you give us as a reviewer but also for the trust you place in us, we will remain available for your suggestions and comments that can improve our work as such (reviewer).

We would be available for other items at review-er.