



**Paper: “Expression de l’Interleukine-33 Plasmatique : Profil des Patients Atteints de Goutte – Une Étude Transversale Analytique”**

**Submitted: 06 October 2025**

**Accepted: 12 December 2025**

**Published: 31 December 2025**

Corresponding Author: Francine Same Bebey

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n36p32

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Belamalem Souad  
University Ibn Tofail, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Ibrahim Bah  
Hospital of Mali

-----  
Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

LE TITRE PEUT ÊTRE AMELIORER

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

LA METHODE COUVRE DES INSSUFISANCE CAR LE RATIO DES CAS ET DES  
TEMOINS N'EST PAS SCIENTIFIQUEMENT SOUTENABLE 43 cas contre 21 temoin ?  
QUELLE EST LA LOGIQUE ?

le machining n'est pas clairement preciser par l'auteur

aussi une etude cas temoin merite de preciser les OR et OR ajusted

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

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

LA METHODE COUVRE DES INSSUFISANCE CAR LE RATIO DES CAS ET DES  
TEMOINS N'EST PAS SCIENTIFIQUEMENT SOUTENABLE 43 cas contre 21 temoin ?  
QUELLE EST LA LOGIQUE ?

le machining n'est pas clairement preciser par l'auteur

aussi une etude cas temoin merite de preciser les OR et OR ajusted

le type d'etude aussi nest ambiguë (etude transversale ou etude de cas temoin)

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

il ya certaines incoherence scientifique le ratio cas et témoin,

le type d'etude nest pas claire

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

la conclusion n'est pas scientiquement soutenable car la methode nest pas consistante  
scientifiquement

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

la reference bibliographique est faible et contient des informations non conformes

***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]

1

***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!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

-----

-----

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

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

Questions

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. The title reflects the aim of the study

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract is brief, it usually presents the main parts of the article

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

It's good

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methodology of this work is clear; compressive, it brings a lot of information

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

It's good

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

The conclusion is clear and gives a general idea of the results obtained

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

the references respect the standards of the journal

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

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

2

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

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

2

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

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

2

***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]

2

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

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

2

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, no revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This manuscript is clear, well structured, the methodology well explained. It meets scientific standards so it will require further publication in your journal after the corrections I have submitted to you

-----