EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute
15 YEARS

Paper: **“Invagination intestinale chronique chez des enfants de 13 et 8 ans : cas cliniques”**

Submitted: 01 May 2025
Accepted: 15 July 2025
Published: 31 July 2025

Corresponding Author: Segbedji Kokou Agbékogni Réné

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n21p172

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Amavi Folly
Service de chirurgie pédiatrique du CHU Sylvanus Olympio Université de Lomé, Togo

Reviewer 2: Ousseini Adakal
Université Dan Dicko Dankoulodo de Maradi, Centre Hospitalier Régional de Maradi, Niger

Reviewer 3: Choua Ouchemi
Service de Chirurgie Générale au CHU-RN Faculté de Sciences de la Santé Humaine de Ndjamena (FSSH)

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
INVAGINATION INTESTINALE CHRONIQUE CHEZ DEUX ENFANTS AGES DE 13 ET 8 ANS : A PROPOS DE DEUX CAS CLINIQUES
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
L'objectif n'est pas clairement élucidé. A revoir
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
erreurs minimes
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
pas vraiment mais comme c'est cas clinique ca peut aller
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
oui des erreurs minimes
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
la conclusion n'est pas très adapté. a revoir
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
oui
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

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]
3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

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):
Quelle est la difference réelle ente II aigue et chronique? un patient qui vient avec une invagination aigue mais avec plusieurs épisodes de désinvagination spontanée dans les mois ou semaines précedents est il considéré comme une II chronique?

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Yes, the title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Ye, the abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Yes, there are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Yes, the study METHODS are explained clearly.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
Yes, the body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
Yes, the CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
Yes, the list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

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):

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
yes
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
yes
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
few grammatical and spelling errors and mistakes
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
yes
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
yes
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
good
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
good
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

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]
3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
the article is good
