

Paper: “Thyroidectomie dans deux Hopitaux de Reference du Niger : Indications et Resultats au Niger”

Submitted: 17 February 2024

Accepted: 06 May 2024

Published: 31 May 2024

Corresponding Author: Boka Tounga Yahouza

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n15p85

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Tamou Sambo Bio
Université de Parakou, Bénin

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 22/03/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/03/2024
Manuscript Title: INDICATIONS AND RESULTATS OF THYROIDECTOMY IN SAHELIAN HOSPITALS EXPERIENCE OF GENERAL AND VISCETRAL SURGERY DEPARTEMENTS IN 422 CASES (NIGER)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	2
<i>The title conveys the gist of the paper's content. However, the title is too long.</i>	

2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The abstract is divided in objectifs, methods, results, and conclusions.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article particularly in the abstract</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>The inclusion and exclusion criteria that lead to the formation of the sample of the study 422 was not explained clearly.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
<i>There is redundancy in the section results.</i> The results are not well presented	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>The conclusions are consistent with the evidence presented. However, the policy implications of the findings should be highlighted.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>The references and appropriate. However the authors did not respect the norms of the reference style</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):

The title is too long. I recommend shortening the title to Thyroidectomy: Niger's Experience and Outcomes.

I am a bit concerned about the statistical aspects of the results. Including only two tables will not suffice for the analysis section. I suggest the authors should make the analysis more rigorous than it is in its present state. It would be greatly appreciated if a table could be added to provide a description of the sample and assess the homogeneity between genders. It is my recommendation that the authors enhance the rigor of the statistical analysis beyond its current state.

Please provide the inclusion and exclusion criteria that lead to the formation of the sample of study 422.

I kindly request that you substitute the terms "retrospective" and "prospective" study with "cross-sectional" study. Additionally, please, check the reference.

In the abstract put the noun of hospitals before abbreviations.

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: TAMOU SAMBO Bio	
University/Country: Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 2024/04/24	Date Review Report Submitted: 2024/04/29
Manuscript Title: THYROIDECTOMIE : EXPERIENCE ET RESULTATS AU NIGER	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0302/24	
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:	
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.	3
<i>(peut être intitulé autrement)</i>	

2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>(respect de la forme. Sur le fond, il se pose des problèmes avec les statistiques)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Quelques fautes à revoir)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(acceptable)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Hamoniser les chiffres et surtout assez d'erreurs de statistiques. Voir les commentaires dans le texte avec le suivi de modifications)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Acceptable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Plusieurs références de thèses)</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):

Vérifier toujours les résultats des staciens