

Paper: “Apport de la Rééducation dans la Prise en Charge de la Lombalgie/Lomboradiculalgie Commune Chronique à Abidjan : Amélioration de la Douleur et de la Capacité Fonctionnelle dans 95% des Cas”

Submitted: 01 August 2023

Accepted: 15 September 2023

Published: 30 September 2023

Corresponding Author: Francine Same

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n27p97

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Antoine Banza
UNFPA/Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)

Reviewer 2: Ouattara Kalilou
Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny de Cocody, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: July, 13 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: July, 13 2023
Manuscript Title: Apport de la rééducation dans la prise en charge de la lombalgie/lomboradiculalgie commune chronique à Abidjan : amélioration de la douleur et de la capacité fonctionnelle dans 95% des cas.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 22-09-07-2023	
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: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
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.	2/5
<i>The title is incomplete and inaccurate.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3/5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5/5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1/5
<i>The methodology is very superficial, not clearly explaining the whole mechanism of the study.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	0/5
<i>The table and figures are in jpeg image format, which suggests copy-paste and therefore plagiarism.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2/5
<i>Superficial</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5/5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. *Votre étude a été réalisée dans un service auquel vous n'appartenez pas. C'est grave car vous n'avez pas prouvé que vous avez obtenu l'autorisation du Chef de service avant de réaliser l'étude.*
2. *Le titre d'une étude doit être complet et inclusif.*
3. *La méthodologie est le cœur d'une étude. Dans votre cas, la prise en charge de la Lombalgie n'a pas été clairement expliquée. Ce qui n'a pas facilité la compréhension des résultats.*
4. *Il est toujours très important de préciser et d'expliquer le test statistique utilisé.*
5. *Quand on réalise une étude sur les résultats d'une prise, le chapitre « Résultats » ne doit contenir que des résultats de cette prise en charge.*

6. *En tant que médecins, ne faites pas de plagiat. Vos figures et tableau sont en format image, faisant penser à du copier-coller et donc du plagiat.*
7. *Vos discussions n'ont pas pris en compte toutes les variables étudiées.*

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Je vous suggère de considérer les évaluations des reviewers. Merci

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: OUATTARA Kalilou	
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 08 Août 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 10 Août 2023
Manuscript Title: Apport de la rééducation dans la prise en charge de la lombalgie/lomboradiculalgie commune chronique à Abidjan : amélioration de la douleur et de la capacité fonctionnelle dans 95% des cas	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0709/2023	
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

Le titre du texte doit être reformulé. En l'état actuel, il apparaît comme un résultat de l'étude	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Le résumé est à reconstituer en un bloc tout en montrant les différentes articulations, c'est-à-dire une brève présentation du contexte du problème à l'étude, le type de l'étude, sa durée, le champ géographique, la méthodologie utilisée et les grands points des résultats obtenus</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Le texte est bien écrit. Pas de coquilles véritables</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
La méthodologie est bien élaborée et elle respecte les indications scientifiques	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Les résultats sont intéressants, clairement exposés. Toutefois, il y'a nécessité de structurer la partie résultat de l'étude autour de deux axes qui devront constituer deux sous-parties. Donc, présenter les résultats en deux sous-titres pour une meilleure appréciation</i> <i>En outre la figure 2 doit être placée avant les commentaires</i> <i>Les caractéristiques sociodémographiques évoquées dans le travail ne sont pas mises en relation avec l'interprétation des résultats. Elles permettent de comprendre quoi? Par conséquent l'on se demande de savoir quelle est leur importance dans cette étude</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>La conclusion et le résumé sont rendent compte le contenu du texte</i> Cependant le résumé tel que présenté est disparate et cela ne facilite pas la lecture. Il est à reconstituer en un bloc tout en gardant les grandes lignes.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Les références bibliographiques sont clairement exposées et leur valeur matérielle est acceptable. Toutefois, des références ne sont pas complètes.</i> <i>Cette partie est à revoir</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Le texte est de bonne qualité. Mais la prise en compte des observations faites est nécessaire

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Le manuscrit peut être publié après la prise en compte des observations faites

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: Antoine Banza Nsungu	Email:
University/Country: UNFPA/Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/08/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/08/2023
Manuscript Title: Apport de la rééducation dans la prise en charge de la lombalgie/lomboradiculalgie commune chronique à Abidjan : amélioration de la douleur et de la capacité fonctionnelle dans 95% des cas	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 48966-1	
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

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<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>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> In general, the data collection methodology is well explained. Mention is made of the software used to perform statistical analyzes (EPI-INFO). However, statistical methods for determining the degree of associations between variables are not clearly presented.	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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	<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):

Methodology:

For the study methodology, give the statistical methods that were used under EPI-INFO to detect associations between the variables of interest for the study, at the statistical level.

Discussion:

Change and enrich the first paragraph of the discussion section, emphasizing the comparison between the results obtained and those of studies carried out in other contexts and try to give possible reasons...