



Paper: “Etude de la co-circulation des virus Grippaux et SARSCoV-2 dans les sites sentinelles d’Infection Respiratoire Aigüe Sévère de la Grippe en République de Guinée (2023-2024)”

Submitted: 28 April 2025

Accepted: 19 June 2025

Published: 30 June 2025

Corresponding Author: Mamadou Aliou Sampou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n18p152

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Cheikh Diouf

Université Gaston BERGER de Saint-Louis du Sénégal

Reviewer 2: Mohamed Houmed Aboubaker

Laboratoire d’Analyse Médicale Mer Rouge, Djibouti

Reviewer 3: Moud Tcholi Idrissa

Université Abdou Moumouni de Niamey, Niger

Reviewer 4: Yapo Antoine Gbocho

Allassane Ouattara de Bouaké, Côte d’Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: MOUD TCHOLI IdrissaE	
University/Country: Université Abdou Moumouni de Niamey/NIGER	
Date Manuscript Received: 06/06/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/06/2025
Manuscript Title: Study of the co-circulation of influenza and SARSCoV-2 viruses in sentinel sites of severe acute respiratory influenza infection in the Republic of Guinea	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---12.---29.05.2025---	
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.	4
<i>The title is relevant and accurately reflects the research focus. However, adding the study period could improve specificity</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The abstract is well-structured and presents key elements. Minor issues in the English version (e.g., “B3N2” instead of “B Victoria”) should be corrected for clarity</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2

<i>The manuscript contains numerous grammatical, typographical, and syntactic errors in both English and French sections. It requires thorough language revision, especially in the methods and discussion sections</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methodology is appropriate and well detailed. The sentinel site selection, inclusion criteria, and virological techniques are adequately described</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are comprehensively presented, but the clarity could be improved by cleaning up tables (some formatting issues, repeated labels like “SEXESEXE”) and integrating figures properly.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion is supported by the data and emphasizes the relevance of integrated surveillance. However, a clearer summary of key findings would strengthen the closing.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are relevant and up to date. A few entries need formatting adjustments (missing issue numbers, inconsistencies in citation styles)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This study addresses a highly relevant topic on the co-circulation of influenza and SARS-CoV-2 in Guinea. The methodology is sound, and the analysis contributes meaningfully to the understanding of respiratory virus surveillance in West Africa. However, major revisions are needed to improve:

- Language and grammar: A full proofreading is essential to correct numerous spelling and syntax issues.
- Structure and formatting: Tables and figures should be standardized and clearly labeled.
- Discussion: Consider restructuring with subheadings and emphasizing the implications of findings more explicitly.
- Consistency: Ensure accurate terminology across French and English versions (e.g., virus names, sites, demographics).

We encourage the authors to revise and resubmit. The topic is important and worthy of publication after improvement

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: GBOCHO Yapo Antoine	
University/Country: Allassane Ouattara de Bouaké – Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 09 / 06 / 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 20 / 06 / 2025
Manuscript Title: Study of the co-circulation of influenza and SARSCoV-2 viruses in sentinel sites of severe acute respiratory influenza infection in the Republic of Guinea	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 05	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Oui	
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: Oui	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. (Please insert your comments) Le titre est assez clair et conforme au contenu de l'article	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Please insert your comments) Le résumé est essentiellement centré sur les résultats, mais bien mené. Il se termine par ailleurs par une conclusion qui présente de façon claire la portée de l'étude en terme de santé publique	3,5
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Please insert your comments)	4

Le manuscrit ne renferme pratiquement pas de fautes de grammaire et d'orthographe. L'expression également est simple et claire. Juste un petit problème d'expression à la page 12 (phrase confuse et difficile à comprendre)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les méthodes et le matériel sont bien détaillés et clairement expliqués	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats sont bien présentés et bien détaillés Ils sont par ailleurs complétés par une discussion assez riche qui montre la pertinence de l'étude. Pour plus de compréhension, il est bon que dans les analyses, les auteurs rappellent les références des illustrations (tableaux et graphiques).	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La conclusion est un peu courte mais conforme au contenu de l'article	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les références sont complètes, suffisantes et appropriées	

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):

Il s'agit d'une étude épidémiologique bien menée.

Nous demandons simplement aux auteurs de prendre en compte les corrections mineures :

-Rappeler les références des illustrations dans le texte afin de bien vous suivre

-Une phrase à revoir (page 12)

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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 Mohamed Houmed Aboubaker	
University/Country: Djibouti	
Date Manuscript Received: 07 juin 2025	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Study of the co-circulation of influenza and SARSCoV-2 viruses in sentinel sites of severe acute respiratory influenza infection in the Republic of Guinea	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>Le titre peut etre modifié legerement : Surveillance of Influenza A/B and SARSCov-2 of circulating virus in severe acute respiratory infection in the Republic of Guinea</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>Ecriture en anglais à corriger par un Anglophone.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>No</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

<i>Matériel et méthode: page 6: Décrire les cibles amplifiées, leurs tailles. La marque Invitrogène de Qiagen doit bien figurer parce que c'est une Marque. La ribonucléase à préciser si elle sert de contrôle interne ou pas.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Page 7: Histogramme est mieux que diagramme circulaire. Précisez les virus à la ligne 2 (Grippe + SARSCov-2)</i> <i>Tableau 1 : Est-ce qu'il y a une autre manière de présenter est possible. On confond l'âge avec le sexe parce qu'ils sont dans la même colonne.</i> <i>Ligne 10-16. Il y a une supposition sur le système immunitaire des enfants inclus dans la cohorte. Cependant, il n'y a pas de confirmation scientifique qui le prouve. Aucune donnée sur le durée d'allaitement des enfants, confortant une cause à effet sur le système immunitaire</i> <i>Page 8 : Commentaire sur la faible proportion de tranche d'âge : C'est mieux dans la discussion</i> <i>Il en est de même pour la répartition de l'échantillonnage des sites sentinelles</i> <i>Tableau 2 : page 9 : Germe à préciser, sinon même commentaire que tableau 1</i> <i>Tableau 3 : page 10 : même commentaire</i> <i>Tableau 4 : à séparer les paramètres. Il y a confusion entre les résultats de l'âge, du sexe et du site.</i> <i>Discussion : page 12 :</i> <i>Pourquoi un faible pourcentage par rapport à Keita et al. Est-ce que la taille de l'échantillon, de site sentinelle, de la durée d'étude, des techniques utilisées ou une épidémie, explique l'étude de Keita ?</i> <i>Ligne 6-9, à reprendre la phrase. Il y a 2 idées qui se chevauchent. Problème de compréhension.</i> <i>Pourquoi l'âge médian est différent. Est-ce que c'est le même protocole d'inclusion, de cible de la population d'étude, d'organisation des structures sanitaires entre la Zambie et la Guinée</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: