

Paper: “Prise en Charge des Appendicites Complicées de l’Adulte à l’Hôpital National de Niamey”

Submitted: 02 June 2023

Accepted: 23 December 2023

Published: 31 December 2023

Corresponding Author: Kadi Idé

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n36p27](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n36p27)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Moussa Kalli
Faculte de Medecine, Ndjamena, Tchad

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: 30 Sept. 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 01 Oct. 2023
Manuscript Title: <i>Prise en charge des appendicites compliquées de l'adulte à l'Hôpital National de Niamey</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Not provided	
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: No	
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.	1
<p><i>Method not adapted to results shown, there is ABSOLUTE need of statistician to provide adapted statistical analysis. Authors have two options:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Either they make it a descriptive study, then no need to see a statistician</i> <i>• Or they profoundly revise the methodology with a statistician!</i> 	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Descriptive analyses are correct, but normality of quantitative variables should be checked. All analytical results are wrong, not using proper statistical tests.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>All the conclusions based on results of the chi-squared test are wrong. It is not the right statistical test.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<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 type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Chers auteurs,

Ce fut un honneur de lire votre manuscrit, une importante série d'appendices compliquées. Ce type de recherche est important en Afrique sub-Saharienne, où des larges séries sont rares. Félicitations d'avoir entrepris cette tâche.

Cependant, plusieurs révisions sont à faire et deux propositions sont possibles :

- Revoir la base de données avec un statisticien et ajuster la partie analytique du travail en utilisant des tests statistiques adaptés. Ceci est FONDAMENTAL car l'usage des tests non adaptés conduit aux conclusions biaisées.
- L'autre option serait de complètement retirer la partie analytique de votre travail, et d'en faire une étude complètement descriptive, ce qui lui garde toujours une bonne valeur, vue la rareté de telles grandes séries en Afrique !

Le reste des éléments à revoir est mentionné le document.

Bonne continuation !

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Dear Editors,

It was a pleasure to review this study. However, some statistical tests were not adapted. We suggest the study to be only descriptive, which is still of great value as such large series are scarce in sub-Saharan Africa.

Best regards!

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: MOUSSA KALLI	
University/Country: TCHAD ,FACULTE DE MEDECINE /NDJAMENA	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 9 OCTOBRE 2023
Manuscript Title: Prise en charge des appendicites compliquées de l'adulte à l'Hôpital National de Niamey	
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
LE TITRE CLAIR ET BIEN ILLUSTRATIF	
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
Voir le texte (mots soulignés en rouge sont des erreurs, en vert des suggestions)	
<i>ET EN JAUNE : une alerte</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
METHODOLOGIE BIEN MENEÉE	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
Tableaux mal présentés Unités non arrondies Titres, colonnes et lignes à harmoniser	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Correct</i> MOTS CLES A COMPLETER	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
REFERENCES NE RESPECTANT PAS LE GUIDELINES DE ESJ ELLES SONT VIEILLISSANTES	
NOUS VOUS SUGGERONS DE VOIR LA REFERENCE CI DESSOUS ET DE SE CONFORMER	
Ceci F, S. Orsini, A. Tudisco et al (2013). Single-incision laparoscopic appendectomy is comparable to conventional laparoscopic and laparotomic appendectomy: our single center single surgeon experience. <i>G Chir</i> ; 34(7-8): 216–9	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: