Paper: **"Traumatisme Ouvert de la Main par Introduction dans le Moulin (main de moulin) Chez l'Enfant : Aspects Epidémiologiques, Lésionnels, et Thérapeutiques au Service de Chirurgie Pédiatrique du Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Sylvanus Olympio de Lomé (Togo)"**

Corresponding Author: Salhadine Yacoub Ahmat

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jean Luc Kambire
Université de Ouahigouya, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: N'guena Yamalet
Médecin chirurgien, CAR

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: KAMBIRE JEAN LUC	
University/Country: Université de Ouahigouya/ Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **Traumatisme ouvert de la main par introduction dans le moulin (main de moulin) chez l'enfant : aspects épidémiologique, lésionnel, et thérapeutique au service de chirurgie pédiatrique du Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Sylvanus Olympio de Lomé (Togo)**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 17265	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**

RAS	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
RAS	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
QUELQUES FAUTES GRAMMATICALES ET D'ORTHOGRAPHE	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
RAS	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
RAS	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
RAS	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
RAS	

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):

Prendre en compte les suggestions portées dans le texte

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

le titre est limpide et intéressant

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Dans la méthodologie on ne sent pas trop la prise en charge dans l'abstract

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

la méthodologie mérite d'être revue un peu sur le plan technique chirurgical

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

quelques coquilles à revoir

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

la conclusion mérite un petit arrangement

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

bonne

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

il faut avoir un échantillon encore plus important