

Paper: “Le suivi de l’efficacité et de la tolérance des antiviraux à action directe dans le traitement de l’hépatite virale C chronique à l’Hôpital national Donka CHU Conakry”

Submitted: 07 October 2024

Accepted: 15 November 2024

Published: 30 November 2024

Corresponding Author: Diallo Mamadou Sarifou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n33p100

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Segbedji Rene
Université de Kara, Togo

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: 21/10/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/10/2024
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de l'efficacité et de la tolérance des antiviraux à action directe dans le traitement de l'hépatite virale C chronique à l'Hôpital national Donka CHU Conakry	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1049/24	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The title has been corrected in the manuscript</i>	

2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>Yes, but improvements need to be made as indicated in the body of the manuscript.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Yes, there is a misuse of punctuation and abbreviations in the French text.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Yes, but improvements need to be made as indicated in the body of the manuscript.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Yes, but they needed to be reorganized.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>YES</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>YES</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):

- For the "Patients and Methods" section of the abstract: it must be rephrased.
- For the graphs, the axes of the abscissa and ordinate must be labeled.
- For the abbreviations used in the manuscript, they should have been clarified before being used.
- For the "Results" section: the presentation of data needs to be revised using subtitles as I did in the correction of the methodology section.
- Please adhere to scientific writing standards and avoid using personal references (our, we, etc.). The manuscript is a scientific text, not an autobiography!!!!
- Please add the appendix indicated in the manuscript.
- Throughout the manuscript, the authors must ensure the correct use of French punctuation. Specifically, a comma should be used instead of a semicolon.
- For ethical approval, authors must include the approval number of the ethics committee.