

Paper: "Aspects Therapeutiques du Decolement de Retine chez les Evacues Sanitares Hors Benin de 2015 a 2020"

Submitted: 20 December 2023

Accepted: 16 April 2024 Published: 30 April 2024

Corresponding Author: Nestor Aigbe

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n12p181

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

the title is relevant to the question and the objective of the study

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

the abstract includes the different parts

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

objectives and methodology should be in the past

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

there were no criteria for non-inclusion or exclusion how many files were included

The centres that received the evacuees are not presented. How therapeutic data had been collected (patients treated outside Benin).

the data were not collected from 2015 to 2020, but rather the study focused on evacuee files from 2015 to 2020

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

Introduction: the question asked is not clear

Results: the following are missing from the results: the characteristics of the

population studied; the size of the population studied

Too many graphs. Repetition between graph and text (e.g. fig 1)

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

the conclusion does not meet the objective

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Compliance with Vancouver standards. Harmonise the spelling of authors' names

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

```
Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
```

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

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Bien préciser la justification de l'étude Type d'étude: observationnelle transversale descriptive la sélection de la population d'étude n'est pas précise Résultats: décrire la caractéristique de la population étudiée, au plus 5 graphiques, répondre essentiellement à l'objectif (aspects thérapeutiques). On retrouve le pronostic, ce qui alourdi le travail
