

Paper: “Facteurs Associés à la Consommation des AINS en Automédication chez les Patients vus en Rhumatologie à Abidjan”

Submitted: 21 February 2024

Accepted: 22 March 2024

Published: 31 March 2024

Corresponding Author: Brice Kevin Kollo Nzima

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n9p236](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n9p236)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oumarou Youssouf

Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Communautaire de Bangui Service de Médecine Interne, Centrafrique

Reviewer 2: Antoine Banza

United Nations Population Fund

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: YOUSOUF	
University/Country: Republique Centrafricaine	
Date Manuscript Received: 09 mars 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 13 mars 2024
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: oui	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: oui	

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
<i>Revoir le titre en tenant compte de l'efficacité des AINS.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>Se conférer aux commentaires faits dans le manuscrit</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Voir les commentaires dans le manuscrit</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>Tenir compte des Remarques faits dans le manuscrit</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Sujet intéressant et d'actualité.

Il était souhaitable de parler aussi des effets secondaires et complications digestives (les ulcères gastroduodénales et les héomorragies digestives) de l'utilisation des AINS.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer M:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

No, the title is not suitable for the study, for reasons that I mentioned in the article. So, instead of "Facteurs déterminant la consommation des AINS en automédication chez les patients vus en rhumatologie à Abidjant", I propose "Facteurs associés à la consommation des AINS en automédication chez les patients vus en rhumatologie à Abidjant"

Indeed, the study highlights possible associations between different types of potential factors and self-medication with NSAIDs but without showing a cause and effect relationship between them.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes

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

Yes, but these errors and mistakes are negligible.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The concepts and variables must be defined beforehand in the section dedicated to the methodology, before being analyzed in the section devoted to the results.

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

Yes, to a large extent.

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

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes, overall.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
