

**Paper: “Résultats du traitement chirurgical des fractures des plateau tibiaux au Centre Hospitalier Universitaire la renaissance de N’Djamena à propos de 35 cas”**

**Submitted: 23 July 2024**

**Accepted: 07 October 2024**

**Published: 31 October 2024**

Corresponding Author: Magloire Dingamnodji

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n30p84

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tamou Sambo

Service de Chirurgie Générale, CHU de Parakou, Université de Parakou, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Djim Hervey Reoulembaye

Université de Lomé, CHU Sylvanus Olympio, Lomé, Togo

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: TAMOU SAMBO	
University/Country: Parakou/Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 2024/08/01	Date Review Report Submitted: 2024/08/07
Manuscript Title: Traitement chirurgical des fractures des plateaux tibiaux au CHU la renaissance de N'Djamena à propos de 35 cas	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0816/24	
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:	

#### 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> <i>(est clair et adapté à l'article)</i>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b> <i>(harmoniser les chiffres avec les résultats et utiliser les mêmes termes)</i>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b> <i>(reformuler certaines phrases des critères d'inclusion)</i>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b> <i>(reformuler les critères d'inclusion. Les résultats étaient déjà annoncés dans la méthodologie)</i>	<b>3</b>

<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>-ramener les résultats énoncés dans la méthodologie au niveau des résultats -Adopter mêmes nombre de chiffres après la virgule -Remplacer les points par les virgules pour les chiffres</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(tenir compte des résultats)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</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): revoir la méthodologie**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

### 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: 05 Septembre 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/09/24
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>Traitement chirurgical des fractures des plateaux tibiaux au CHU la renaissance de N'Djamena à propos de 35 cas</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>NON</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>OUI</b> You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>OUI</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] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>On pourrait reformuler le titre: Resultat du traitement chirurgical des fractures des plateau tibiaux. Sinon avec ce titre nous faisons allusion aux différentes techniques chirurgicales utilisées dans le traitement chirurgical de ces fracture/</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Refaire le résumé selon leplan ci dessus.</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Il y a quelques fautes à corriger et quelques phrases à améliorer pour une meilleure compréhension.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2,5</b>
<i>Revoir les critères d'inclusion et de non inclusion.</i>	

<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2Revoir</b>
<i>Il faut revoir le resultat avec le sex ratio. Par rapport à la fréquence, on ne sait pas si c'est une fréquence par rapport à toutes les prises en charge chirurgicales en traumatology? Remettre l'iconographie par rapport au resultat. Si cela est possible il faut les clichés contrôle finaux après consolidation. Mieux travailler les tableaux et les mettre aussitot après l'annonce dans le corps du travail.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Revoir surtout e resumé.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Revoir les reference selon Vancouver.</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):**

**Revoir la méthodologie pour permettre aux lecteurs de mieux comprendre l'étude. L'aspect financier de la prise en charge n'a pas été mentionné.**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**