

Paper: “Prise en Charge d’Une Dechirure Complicee du Perinee Post Coital au Centre Hospitalier Universitaite de l’Amitie Sino-Centrafricaine”

Submitted: 20 July 2023

Accepted: 16 September 2023

Published: 30 September 2023

Corresponding Author: Gilles-Davy Kossa-Ko-Ouakoua

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n27p87

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Florentin Nguena
Université de Bangui, Central African Republic

Reviewer 2: Thierry Nesseim
Université Iba Der THIAM (UIDT) de Thiès, Sénégal

Reviewer 3: Djim Hervey Reoulembaye
Université de Lomé, CHU Sylvanus Olympio, Lomé, Togo

Reviewer 4: Geoffroy Tenete
Université de Lomé, Togo

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: N'GUENA Ulrich	
University/Country: universit� de Bangui	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/08/23	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/08/23
Manuscript Title: correct	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre est clair , excellent travail	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résumé est aussi clair	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Peu de faute	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Une très bonne méthode	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résultat est exact mais il faut compléter la partie evaluation	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Bonne conclusion	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Respect les normes fondamentales.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Pour les auteurs, il est important d'évaluer la patiente à un recul minimum d'au moins 1 an pour deceler les vraies complications.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Thierry Daniel Tamsir NESSEIM	
University/Country: Université Iba Der THIAM (UIDT) de Thiès / Sénégal	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/08/2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: PRISE EN CHARGE DE DECHIRURE COMPLIQUEE DU PERINEE POST COITAL AU CENTRE HOSPITALIER UNIVERSITAIRE DE L'AMITIE SINO-CENTRAFRICAINE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0805/23	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Revoir la formulation de certaines phrases</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Revoir les références et les mettre en adéquation avec les recommandations de la revue</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 07/08/2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Prise en charge de déchirure compliquée du périnée post coital au centre hospitalier universitaire de l'amitié sino-centrafricaine	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.	3,5
<i>Est le seul cas de cette zone? Nous sommes dans des zones de conflit armées et intercommunautaire où les violences sexuelles se font de plus en plus fréquentes alors ça serait intéressant de recenser toutes les complications dans une étude pour codifier la prise en charge et sonner la sonnette d'alarme afin de protéger les couche vulnérables.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>Revoir la discussion pour respecter le plan de ESJ.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Il y a quelques coquilles à régler dans le travail et surtout l'harmonie des forms.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>La reparation s'est faite en urgence mais je ne sais pas si c'est sous anesthésie générale ou pas. La laparotomie a été réalisé en double équipe avec le chirurgien visceral ou pas? Quelques interrogation pour mieux comprendre la méthodologie.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2,5
<i>Après la prise en charge médicale il fallait signaler le suivi à long terme de ce jeune cet enfant. Quelle a été la prise en charge psychologique. La patient connaissant le visage de son agresseur, quelle a été la conduit à ténir vis à vis des autorités compétantes?</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>Revoir la conclusion et le résumé afin de permettre une bonne comprehension de l'étude.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Revoir les reference par rapport selon de vancover.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 07/08/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 16/08/2023
Manuscript Title: PRISE EN CHARGE DE DECHIRURE COMPLIQUEE DU PERINEE POST COITAL AU CENTRE HOSPITALIER UNIVERSITAIRE DE L'AMITIE SINO-CENTRAFRICAINE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0805/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.	4
<i>Le titre est assez clair et ne souffre pas d'ambiguité</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Le résumé est bien fait. Il faut revoir les mots clés</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Assez de fautes à corriger</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Sans commentaire à mon niveau</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
L'observation est améliorée en fonction des remarques faites	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Sans commentaires</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Respecter les consignes du journal</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):

Nous préférons le terme de *victime* au terme de *survivante* utilisée dans l'article

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: