



Paper: “Ré-implantation pulpaire de doigt sans anastomose microvasculaire : à propos de trois cas”

Submitted: 21 April 2025

Accepted: 28 May 2025

Published: 30 June 2025

Corresponding Author: Abdourahmane Ouangre

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n18p40

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jean Luc Kambire

Service de chirurgie, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Régional de Ouahigouya, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: Yaovi Y. Dellanh

University of Lome, Togo

Reviewer 3: Mahamadou Habibou Dalatou Malam Maman

Hôpital National Amirou Boubacar Diallo de Niamey, Niger

Reviewer 4: Magloire Dingamnodji

Service de chirurgie Orthopédique et traumatologie du CHU la renaissance,
Faculté de médecine de l'Université Adam Barka d'Abéché (UNABA)

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes the title is clear.

no any comments

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes the Abstract is clear BUT i propose to the authors to review the structuration, because the study is a report of only 3 cases, so we don't need to talk about methods and results but

Observations 1, 2, 3...

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

no

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

I propose a plan without methods and results, like:

Introduction

Observations

cases1

case 2

cases 3

Discussion

Conclusion

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Just one errors sentence in the discussions to be corrected: "bien que nos moignons ne soient n'aient pas été acheminées dans des conditions idéales. Le facteur déterminant dans la survie après replantation digitale serait la réalisation et la réussite de l'anastomose veineuse (Lima, 2015)"

"Bien que les moignons de nos patients ne soient pas acheminés....."

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

We need more proof by other reports in literature of digital replantation without microanastomosis

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I propose to the authors to review the plan like this:

Introduction

Observations

Case 1

Case 2

Case 3

Discussion

Conclusion

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Replace finger in the title by "fingertips ou finger pulp"

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Reduce the conclusion

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

fingertip or finger pulp replantation

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Add number of surgeons and his status (senior, junior, resident)

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Add x-ray of fingers if possible

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

reference 2 is repeated

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
TITRE INCOMPLET

FAIRE SORTIR LE DELAI DE LA PEC
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
REVOIR LE RESUME

OBJECTIF
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
OBJECTIF, OBSERVATIONS, CONCLUSION
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
IL FAUT MIEUX ADOPTER LE PLAN SUIVANT:

- introduction
- observations
- commentaire ou discussion
- conclusion

NB: vous avez seulement deux cas dont, le mieux c'est de faire comme cas clinique

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
beaucoup de fautes de syntaxe : a revoir

enlever la partie de la méthodologie

c'est l'antibioprophylaxie ou bien l'antibiothérapie ? préciser la molécule avec DCI ET LA
POSOLOGIE

laide d'une aiguille (il faut espacer avec l'....

Cette amputation de doigt consecutive a un traumatisme souvent complexe de la main est un
challenge pour le chirurgien (Tamulevicius, 2025). : ecrire autrement : elle est consecutive et
demeure un challenge....

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
AFFIRMATIF

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
bien rediger et respecte les normes de la revue ESJ

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **METHODS** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

revoir le titre en incluant le délai de PEC

adopter le plan suivant : INTRODUCTION, OBSERVATIONS, COMMENTAIRE OU DISCUSSION et CONCLUSION

Corriger les fautes de syntaxe

donner les critères d'évaluation fonctionnelle

le respect de principe d'Helsinki

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

RAS pour le titre en dehors d'une correction d'une erreur orthographique (sur un plan étymologique, utiliser ré-implantation

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

RAS en dehors des observations à prendre en compte

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

En effet, quelques erreurs grammaticales et orthographiques à corriger

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

OUI

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

OUI

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

RAS

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

OUI

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Prendre en compte les différentes observations pour en améliorer le contenu
