



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Factors Associated with Colorectal Cancer Diagnosis Compared to Other Digestive Cancers at the National Cancer Control Center of Niamey (Niger), 2018–2023: A HospitalBased Analytical Study”

Submitted: 11 February 2026

Accepted: 31 March 2026

Published: 30 April 2026

Corresponding Author: Fatima Mohamed

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n12p46

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Elena Hunt
Laurentian University, Canada

Reviewer 2: Choua Ouchemi,
University of N'Djaména, Chad

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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: Elena Hunt	
University, Country: Laurentian University, Canada	
Date Manuscript Received: March 7	Date Review Report Submitted: March 14
Manuscript Title: <i>Factors Associated with Colorectal Cancer Diagnosis among Patients with Digestive Malignancies at the National Cancer Control Center of Niamey, Niger (2018–2023)</i>	
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: 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.	5
The title accurately reflects the study population, setting, timeframe, and main objective.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
The abstract is well-structured and includes all essential components. It accurately summarizes the study without unnecessary detail.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The manuscript is generally readable, but several minor grammatical inconsistencies appear, likely due to translation from French. Here are a few examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• “Professionnel status” instead of “Professional status.”• “Down income” instead of “Low income.”• Occasional spacing and punctuation inconsistencies in tables.	

These do not impede comprehension but would benefit from light language editing.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methodology is detailed and transparent. The level of detail is appropriate for reproducibility.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Overall, the findings are coherent and supported by the data. However, a few issues should be corrected: Some table formatting is inconsistent (e.g., percentages misaligned, decimal commas vs. points); In Table 4, “Anus 0 (0,5)” appears inconsistent with the rest of the dataset; The multivariate analysis reports wide confidence intervals, which the authors acknowledge, but this should be emphasized as a limitation.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusion accurately reflects the results.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The reference list is extensive, up-to-date, and includes both regional and international sources.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Good and important work, bravo!

Considerations:

Emphasize the implications of wide confidence intervals in the multivariate model, as they suggest limited statistical power. Add a brief note on potential underreporting of behavioral factors due to sociocultural norms.