

Paper: “Activation biophysique chez des patients schizophrènes sous différents traitements médicamenteux pris en charge au Service d’Addictologie et Hygiène Mentale (SAHM) d’Abidjan (Côte d’Ivoire)”

Submitted: 26 August 2024

Accepted: 07 October 2024

Published: 31 October 2024

Corresponding Author: Adou Yao

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n30p87](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n30p87)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Coulibaly Siaka
National Institute of Youth and Sports, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Gnamien Konan Bah
Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé, Côte d’Ivoire

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: SIAKA COULIBALY	
University/Country: National Institute of Youth and Sports / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: September 3, 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: September 05, 2024
Manuscript Title: Biophysical activation in schizophrenic patients on different drug treatments managed at the Abidjan Addictology and Mental Hygiene Service (SAHM)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 14	
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: yes 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.	5/5
<i>The title is clear and appropriate to the content of the article. It is both accurate and relevant to the results and methodology described in the study.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4/5
<i>The abstract clearly presents an objective, a methodology, and results. The abstract provides a comprehensive framework by mentioning the objective, an appropriate methodology, as well as key results of the study.</i>	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3/5
<i>The article has few grammatical and spelling errors, which contributes to good readability. However, a few formulations could be refined to improve clarity.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3/5
<i>The study methods described in this study are generally well presented, but some improvements need to be made to increase the clarity and accuracy of the methodology. First of all, the description of the sample is quite clear, mentioning that the study involves 145 schizophrenic patients aged 16 to 35 years, divided between those on first-generation antipsychotic treatment (91 patients) and those on second-generation treatment (54 patients). However, it is useful to specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria, as well as the method of participant selection (e.g., random sampling, voluntary selection, etc.), in order to better understand the representativeness of the sample. The section on statistical analysis mentions the use of the Shapiro-Wilk test to test the normality of the data, which shows attention to methodological rigour. However, no information is provided on how the missing data were handled, which could affect the validity of the conclusions.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4/5
<i>The analysis of the results provided is generally clear, but it presents some elements that could be improved to ensure better understanding and consistency.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>The summary and conclusions are generally accurate and in line with the results presented, but there are a few points that require attention to ensure that they are fully supported by the data. There is a small inconsistency in some of the comparisons. For example, there are cases where a difference is reported but is not significantly supported by a p-value of less than 0.05 (such as BMI in women on second-generation treatment). These points need to be clarified to avoid generalized conclusions based on statistically insignificant results.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3/5
<i>The references mentioned appear to be correct in their general format (adherence to citation standards), but there are a few points that need to be checked or adjusted to make them fully appropriate and complete.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The analysis of the results you provided is generally clear, but it includes some elements that could be improved to ensure better understanding and coherence. Below is an assessment of the clarity and relevance of the results:

1. Overall structure and data coherence:

- The data is well-presented, with clear comparisons between the different groups (men and women undergoing first- and second-generation antipsychotic treatments).
 - The use of descriptive statistics such as weight, body mass index (BMI), waist circumference, and hip circumference provides a precise overview of the results.
 - The p-values are clearly indicated, allowing for the assessment of the statistical significance of the observed differences.
2. Strengths:
- Clear comparison before and after treatment: The results are well-compared before and after treatments for both generations of antipsychotics, clearly showing the evolution of physical parameters.
 - Distinction by sex and age group: The separation of results by sex and age group (16-25 years and 26-35 years) adds precision to the analysis.
 - Statistical significance: The indicated p-values allow for evaluating the importance of the observed differences, and this is well-detailed in the results.
3. Areas for improvement:
- Inconsistencies in the results:
 - Comparison of physical measurements: In some cases, it is mentioned that measurements like weight and hip circumference are lower before the treatment and then after the treatment (for example, "the hip circumference presented by women before second-generation antipsychotic treatment is lower than what they had after treatment (94.18 cm < 102.64 cm)"). However, it is sometimes difficult to follow this progression because some data seem contradictory.
 - Inconsistency in overall results: You repeatedly mention significant overall results for schizophrenic women under first-generation treatments, but it would be important to clarify whether these results apply consistently to both generations of treatments.
 - Explanation of statistical tests:
 - p-value = 0.000: It is more appropriate to write "< 0.001" rather than "0.000", as a p-value of 0.000 does not technically exist in statistical tests. This would prevent any confusion in the interpretation of the results.
 - Non-significant p-value: For certain variables, such as BMI or waist circumference, the p-values show non-significant results (e.g., p-value = 0.789), but no interpretation is provided in this regard. It would be useful to mention that these results do not show significant differences and explain why these results might still be interesting.
 - Clarification of the term "activation":
 - The term "biophysical activation" is used without a detailed explanation of what it exactly means. To improve clarity, it would be helpful to clearly define what is meant by "biophysical activation" in the context of this study (is it an increase in body mass, an improvement in metabolic function, etc.).

4. Recommendations for improving the writing:
 - Use shorter sentences: Some sentences are long and contain multiple ideas at once. Breaking them into shorter sentences would improve comprehension.
 - Highlight significant differences: While some differences are non-significant, it might be interesting to group them separately in a distinct paragraph to avoid mixing them with significant results.
 - Overall results and comparison: It would be useful to summarize the overall results in a table or graph to provide a clear overview of the differences between groups.

Concerning bibliographical references

The references mentioned appear to be correct in their general format (citation standards are followed), but a few points need to be checked or adjusted to make them fully appropriate and complete:

Benmeddah, M. B. F. (2022):

- The reference is well-structured, but the provided link seems incorrect. It redirects to a document-sharing site (Slide Share) rather than the university repository. It is preferable to directly use the institutional link to the thesis if available.

BOST, A. (2016):

- The link to 'semantic scholar.org' seems to be an indirect access. If possible, use the official URL or a reliable university database directly.

Boule, M., et al. (2014):

- The link '<https://www.lifementalhealth.com>' seems incorrect or inappropriate for an academic report. It should point to a scientific database or a reliable site. This link deserves verification.

Charil De, V. M. (2011):

- The link '<https://hal.univ-lorraine.fr/hal-01733534>' is correct, but it can be improved by removing superfluous elements such as 'Sciences du Vivant' after the comma for better clarity.

Desmettre, S. (2009):

- The reference is correct, and the DOI is a good indicator of validity. Nothing to change.

El Bouaichi, N. (2022):

- The link '<https://wd.fmpm.uca.ma>' seems incomplete or non-functional. It should be verified, and a direct link to the thesis or institution should be provided.

El Ferahi, D. (2019):

- The link to '<https://dumas.ccsd.cnrs.fr/dumas-02384858>' is valid. However, it would be useful to check its functionality.

Franck, N., & Demily, C. (2009):

- The DOI '10.1016/j.amp.2007.10.017' is correct and appropriate.

Koula, B. A. (2016):

- The link '<http://biblio.univ-alger.dz>' seems too generic. If possible, provide a more specific link to the thesis in question.

Locatelli, L., & Golay, A. (2018):

- The link 'www.revmed.ch' seems correct, but it is preferable to use a DOI or a more precise URL for the article.

Méa, N. F. A. (2013):

- Indicate whether the thesis is published or not (as mentioned for other references). The link seems to be missing.

OMS (2022, 2015):

- These references are correct. Nothing to adjust.

Paquito, B., & Gregory, N. (2011):

- The DOI is correct and appropriate.

Provencher, M. D., et al. (2016):

- The DOI link is valid.

Quenet, B. (2013):

- The link '<https://aurore.unilim.fr>' seems generic. Specifying the path to the specific thesis would be preferable.

Siu, P. F. (2021):

- The reference is correct, and the link is valid.

Smogur, M. (2009):

- The link '<https://www.hug.ch>' seems correct, but it is always better to provide a direct link to the article.

Solida, A., et al. (2011):

- The DOI is valid.

Soro, T. E. (2018, 2023):

- Mention whether the theses are published or not, and provide direct links to the institutions if available.

Trachsel, N., & Armin, V. G. (2011):

- The link 'www.sanp.ch' is appropriate.

Yéo, T. Y. J.M., et al. (2014):

- The link to the publication seems to be missing.

Zampetas, D. (2022):

- The link '<https://dumas.ccsd.cnrs.fr/dumas-04069183>' is valid.

General suggestions:

- Check the links to ensure they are functional and directly point to the documents.
- Whenever possible, prefer DOI links or links to academic institutions rather than document-sharing sites.
- Mention whether the theses are published or not, and provide more details about their accessibility.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The article makes a relevant contribution to its field of study with interesting results. A careful review of certain aspects would further enhance the scientific rigor and clarity of the presentation, making the article more accessible to readers. These comments aim to assist the author in improving the scientific quality of the article and facilitating its publication.

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: GNAMIEN MODESTE	
University/Country: UNIVERSITE JEAN LOROUGNON GUEDE -DALOA	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/09/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/09/2024
Manuscript Title: Activation biophysique chez des patients schizophrènes sous différents traitements médicamenteux pris en charge au Service d'Addictologie et Hygiène Mentale d'Abidjan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0947/24	
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
Insérer Côte d'Ivoire dans une parenthèse à la fin du titre. La version anglaise n'est pas conforme à la version française	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
Préciser le champ disciplinaire de l'étude. Préciser la technique d'échantillonnage utilisée Population mère.....Mode de sélection	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Les erreurs grammaticales sont moindres	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
L'introduction ne contient pas de données sur le contexte ivoirien. Les informations mentionnées sont générales. Veuillez mentionner le site d'étude et sa spécificité par rapport au sujet...Il s'agit d'une description des sujets étudiées en lien à la recherche effectuée...	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Résultat bien présenté	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Bien construite	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Beaucoup d'auteurs cités dans la rubrique références sont introuvables dans le texte	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Prière prendre en compte l'ensemble des observations.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: