

**Paper: “Expérience de prise en charge de Xeroderma Pigmentosum au service de Dermatologie-vénérologie à Cotonou”**

Submitted: 04 November 2023

Accepted: 20 May 2024

Published: 30 May 2024

Corresponding Author: Peggy Mboli-Goumba Guérendo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n15p77

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Muhindo Valimungighe Moïse  
Universite Catholique du Graben-Butembo, Congo

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Youssouf Oumarou  
Republique Centrafricaine

# 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: <b>MUHINDO VALIMUNGIGHE Moïse</b>	
University/Country: <b>UNIVERSITE CATHOLIQUE DU GRABEN-BUTEMBO/RDCONGO</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>22/04/2025</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>01/05/2024</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>A case of xeroderma pigmentosum observed at the CNHU-HKM of Cotonou.</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0513/24</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>YES</b>	
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: <b>YES</b>	

## 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] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Une proposition des titres déjà faite</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Mettre la version française de abstract</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Les corrections sont intégrées dans le texte	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	
<i>Bonne méthodologie mais il faut éclater certaines choses comme reprises dans le texte</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Voir texte</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Voir texte: Une proposition de la conclusion</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<i>Pas de commentaires</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):**

Félicitons l'équipe de rédaction pour ce cas clinique rare  
Insérer les recommandations incluses dans le texte

# 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!*

Manuscript Title: Expérience de prise en charge de xeroderma pigmentosum au service de Dermatologie – Vénérologie à Cotonou
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0513/24
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: 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>

It would be good to precise the location of the hospital. And, as there was no genetic confirmation, I suggest to authors to say: “Expérience de prise en charge d’une <b>suspicion de xeroderma pigmentosum</b> au service de Dermatologie-vénérologie du CNHU de Cotonou”	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
There are some grammatical mistakes easy to correct	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

It would be appropriate to say something about results of multidisciplinary investigation and evolution of the disease 6 or 12 months after the beginning of your management.

# 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: youssouf oumarou	
University/Country: republique centrafricaine	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>La méthodologie doit être bien spécifier</b>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Il manqué beaucoup de precision dans l’histoire de la maladie, exemple l’antécédent de trouble psychoteur de l’enfant n’était précisé mais apparait dans l’introduction à la fin</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<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 mais il manque trop d'information dans la méthodologie qu'il faut compléter pour rendre ce travail scientifique acceptable.**