



**Paper: “Profile of Temporal Bone Computed Tomography Examinations at the University Hospital Center (CHU) Campus of Lomé”**

**Submitted: 25 August 2025**

**Accepted: 15 February 2026**

**Published: 28 February 2026**

Corresponding Author: Judith Edwige Guiaba Kette Mokpondo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n6p74

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hisham S.I. Al-Shaikhli  
College of Nursing, Qatar University, Qatar

Reviewer 2: Adriana Gherbon  
University of Medicine and Pharmacy Timisoara, Romania

Reviewer 3: Blinded

# ***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: Hisham Alshaikhli	
University/Country: Qatar University - Qatar	
Date Manuscript Received: 17/12/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 2/1/2026
Manuscript Title: <b>Profile of CT scans of petrous bones at the UHC-Campus of Lomé.</b>	
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:	

## **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><b>Questions</b></i>	<i><b>Rating Result</b></i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>

<p><i>The title is clear and identifies the imaging modality, anatomical focus, and study setting. However, it is only partially adequate in reflecting the full scope of the article. The manuscript presents a descriptive clinico-radiological study with emphasis on indications, techniques, and pathological findings—particularly trauma—which is not fully captured by the term “profile.” A more specific title would better align with the content.</i></p>	
<p><b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p>
<p><i>Yes. The abstract clearly includes the objectives, methods, and results, and they are presented in a logical and coherent manner, adequately reflecting the study content.</i></p>	
<p><b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b></p>	<p><b>2.5</b></p>
<p>Yes. The article contains several grammatical errors and spelling mistakes, mainly related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistent terminology and spelling (e.g., <i>petrous bons</i> instead of <i>petrous bones</i>, <i>Tinnisitus</i> instead of <i>Tinnitus</i>).</li> <li>• Grammatical issues such as incorrect verb tenses, missing articles, and awkward sentence constructions.</li> <li>• Typographical and formatting inconsistencies in tables, headings, and percentages.</li> <li>• Non-standard or incorrect English usage, likely reflecting direct translation from French (e.g., sentence structure and word choice).</li> </ul> <p>These issues do not invalidate the scientific content but require careful language editing to meet the standards of a prestigious international journal</p>	
<p><b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b></p>	<p><b>3.5</b></p>
<p>Yes, the study methods are generally explained clearly. The authors specify the study design (prospective, descriptive), study period, setting, CT equipment and technical parameters, inclusion criteria, and data analysis method. This allows the reader to understand how the study was conducted.</p> <p>However, some elements would benefit from minor clarification, such as more precise inclusion/exclusion criteria and clearer justification of certain methodological choices. Overall, the methods are understandable but could be refined for greater methodological rigor and reproducibility</p>	
<p><b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b></p>	<p><b>3.5</b></p>

*The results are generally clear and logically presented, with appropriate use of tables and figures to illustrate the findings. The main outcomes are understandable and consistent with the study objectives.*

*However, the results section contains minor errors and inconsistencies, including:*

- *Small numerical and percentage inconsistencies across tables and text,*
- *Terminology and spelling errors (e.g., tinnitus-related terms),*
- *Occasional formatting issues in tables.*

*These issues do not undermine the overall findings but require careful revision to ensure accuracy, clarity, and consistency in line with journal standards*

**6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.**

**4**

*Yes, the conclusions are generally accurate and supported by the study results. They appropriately summarize the main findings, particularly the predominant role of CT in petrous bone trauma, conductive hearing loss, and chronic otitis media, and its limited value in vertigo, tinnitus, and non-traumatic facial paralysis.*

*However, the conclusions would be stronger if they were more closely linked to the study's numerical results and if minor overgeneralizations were avoided. Overall, the conclusions are consistent with and justified by the presented data*

**7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.**

**3.5**

*Yes, the references are generally appropriate and relevant to the topic. They include key works on temporal bone anatomy, CT imaging, trauma, and otologic pathology, as well as regional and international studies that support the discussion.*

*However, the reference list is not fully comprehensive. Some citations are dated, and more recent, high-impact international references could strengthen the manuscript. Additionally, there are minor inconsistencies in formatting and citation style that should be corrected to meet journal standard*

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

The manuscript addresses an important and relevant topic in otologic imaging and provides useful local data on the use of CT in petrous bone pathology. The study objectives are clear, the methodology is generally appropriate, and the conclusions are supported by the results.

However, the paper would benefit from several minor improvements. First, the title could be slightly refined to better reflect the descriptive and clinico-radiological scope of the study. Second, careful English language editing is strongly recommended, as there are noticeable grammatical and spelling errors, as well as some awkward sentence constructions that may affect readability.

In the Methods section, a clearer description of the inclusion and exclusion criteria, along with brief justification of certain methodological choices, would improve clarity and reproducibility. In the Results section, minor inconsistencies in percentages, terminology, and table formatting should be corrected to ensure accuracy and coherence between text and tables.

The discussion is well developed but could be strengthened by a more concise synthesis of findings and by referencing a few more recent international studies. Finally, the reference list is appropriate but would benefit from minor formatting corrections and the inclusion of more up-to-date literature.

Overall, the study is scientifically sound, and addressing these points will substantially enhance the quality and readability of the manuscript

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**