

Paper: “Management of Ectopic Pregnancies at the Community University Hospital Center (CUHC) in Bangui, Central African Republic”

Submitted: 14 September 2024

Accepted: 19 December 2024

Published: 31 December 2024

Corresponding Author: Rose de Lima Kogboma Wongo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n36p36

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gordana Stankovska
University of Tetova, Republic of Macedonia

Reviewer 2: Julian Kraja
University of Shkodra “Luigj Gurakuqi”, Albania

Reviewer 3: Yasser Abu Jaish
Al-Maarefa University, KSA

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: Prof.Dr.Gordana Stankovska	
University/Country: International Balkan University, Skopje, Republic of North Macedonia	
Date Manuscript Received: 21 November 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 25.11.2024
Manuscript Title: Management of Extra-Uterine Pregnancies at the Community Clinic	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0986/24	
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: 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
The title is clear enough and corresponds to the content. Fully meets results and discussion.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
The abstract contains all necessary elements: purpose, methods and results. The abstract is acceptable.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

Some language (grammar, especially the use of tenses) polishing is definitely needed.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The study methods are well chosen, appropriately used, and clearly explained. They ensure effective research performance.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
They explained their results very clear using tables and figures. The authors found that majority of pregnant women were under 35 years of age, multiparous and had some type of genital infections.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The study methods are well chosen, appropriately used, and clearly explained. They ensure effective research performance. Suggestion: Some more generations/syntheses to be added to the conclusions, especially about the management of ectopic pregnancy.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
The references demonstrate a sufficient range of knowledge on the topic. The fact that all references are respectively old (the latest ones are of 2008 and 2010) must not be considered as a negative feature of the manuscript.	

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):

Your empirical study is on a very interesting, challenging and topical problem. The manuscript is well written and structured, with clearly presented purposes, methodology and results. The research is simple and easy to understand. My overall opinion is that your manuscript should be accepted but after doing some minor improvements:

1. Some additional language (grammar, especially the use of tenses) polishing is needed.
2. The Conclusion is short. Add some more generations/syntheses.

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!

Reviewer Name: Julian Kraja	
University/Country: University of Shkodra “Luigj Gurakuqi” / Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 20. 11. 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 26. 11. 2024
Manuscript Title: Management of Extra-Uterine Pregnancies at the Community Clinic	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---	
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
<i>The title refers to Management of Extra-Uterine Pregnancies</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>The methodology is unclear. The study methodology should be properly specified. If the study is cross sectional, then the questionnaire should be specified. However, this study is not cross sectional.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1

<i>The methodology is unclear. There is no information about the questionnaire used. To whom have they referred to build this questionnaire. However, this study is not cross sectional.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Yes</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>The references used are very old.</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):

To regulate the methodology. To define the type of methodology well.
Also to review the literature, using more contemporary literature.

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!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Yasser Abu Jaish	
University/Country: ALMaarefa University - KSA	
Date Manuscript Received: 19 – 11- 2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Management of Extra-Uterine Pregnancies at the Community Clinic Thibaut Boris Clavaire Songo-Kette Gbekere	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	4
<i>The title is clear and appropriately reflects the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>The abstract effectively presents the objectives, methods, and results of the study.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Minor grammatical errors and spelling mistakes are present and should be addressed for improved accuracy and professionalism.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

<i>The study methods are briefly explained but require additional detail to ensure clarity and facilitate a thorough understanding.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are clear and free from errors; however, they would benefit from being presented in greater detail and organized more systematically for improved clarity and impact.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion is well-written but would benefit from being more comprehensive, providing a broader synthesis and deeper insight into the subject matter.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>References should be appropriately aligned with their corresponding paragraphs. Ideally, they should be recent and reflect the latest updates in the field. All references must adhere to the APA style guidelines.</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: