

Paper: “Résultats du traitement chirurgical des fractures malléolaires de l’adulte au Centre Hospitalier Régional de Sokodé”

Submitted: 26 April 2024

Accepted: 24 September 2024

Published: 30 September 2024

Corresponding Author: Yaovi Y. Dellanh

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n27p152](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n27p152)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hermann Victoire Feigoudozoui
Félix Houphouët-Boigny University, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Moussa Kalli
Faculté de Médecine de N'Djamena, Chad

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: MOUSSA KALLI	
University/Country: FACULTE MEDECINE DE N'Djamena /TCHAD	
Date Manuscript Received: 3 juin 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 11 juin 2024
Manuscript Title: Résultats du traitement chirurgical des fractures malléolaires de l'adulte au CHR Sokodé	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0523/24	
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.	4
<i>TITRE BIEN PERTINENT</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
RAS	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
les différentes parties sont bien définies mais quelques coquilles	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2

methodologie à reprendre :type d etude à bien preciser, les differents scores utilisés doivent etre decrits ici .Revoir egalement la partie statistique	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
RESULTATS PERTINENTS MAIS MAL PRESENTES	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
QUELQUES COQUILLES : pas de chiffres dans la conclusion	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>references non numerotées , vieillissantes et trop +++</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	+
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Les mots soulignés en vert : suggestion

Jaune ; alerte

Rouge : enlever

REVOIR LA METHODOLOGIE (TYPE D ETUDE) et RESPECTER LE SQUELETTE DE LA PRESENTATION DES RESULTATS

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: