



Paper: “Facteur de risque d’AVC chez les patients hypertendus au Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Morafeno Toamasina : étude rétrospective cas-témoins”

Submitted: 21 July 2025

Accepted: 30 March 2026

Published: 30 April 2026

Corresponding Author: Innocent Injakanasy

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n12p149

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Alassani Adébayo
Université de Parakou, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Ayekoe Adou Ignace
Institut National d’Hygiène Publique (INHP), Côte d’Ivoire

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: ALASSANI Adébayo	
University/Country: Université de Parakou, Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 29 janvier 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 29 janvier 2026
Manuscript Title: FACTEURS DE RISQUE D'AVC CHEZ LES PATIENTS HYPERTENDUS AU CENTRE HOSPITALIER UNIVERSITAIRE MORAFENO TOAMASINA : ETUDE RETROSPECTIVE CAS-TEMOINS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0230/26	
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.

<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. <i>(Sans commentaires)</i>	3
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results. <i>(Corriger les fautes mineures et les prendre en compte dans la traduction en anglais)</i>	3
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(Quelques fautes de grammaire et de syntaxe à prendre en compte)</i>	3
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

<i>(Une étude prospective est vivement souhaitée avec beaucoup plus de patients inclus pour améliorer la qualité des données)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Sans commentaires)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Sans commentaires)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>(Références trop vieilles)</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):

Corriger les quelques fautes d'orthographe
 Clarifier la méthodologie
 Nécessité de donner la prévue du comité d'éthique
 Actualiser les références

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: AYEKOE ADOU IGNACE	
University/Country: Institut National d'Hygiène Publique (INHP)	
Date Manuscript Received: 31 janvier 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 02 février 2026
Manuscript Title: FACTEURS DE RISQUE D'AVC CHEZ LES PATIENTS HYPERTENDUS AU CENTRE HOSPITALIER UNIVERSITAIRE MORAFENO TOAMASINA : ETUDE RETROSPECTIVE CAS-TEMOINS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0230/26	
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
Il est clair et explicite, mentionnant bien le lieu, la population et le type d'étude	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	2
Le résumé est globalement bien structuré, mais il contient des imprecisions: Il faut préciser que le diagnostic de l'AVC a été fait par imagerie scanner/IRM Il y a trop de résultats d'ODDS RATIO mentionnés ,il faut écrire l'essentiel, La conclusion est vague non pertinente	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Le niveau académique est acceptable avec moins de fautes grammaticales</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Se référer au commentaire inséré dans le document</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Des erreurs de calculs des odds ratios et d'intervalle de confiance sont constatées Les auteurs sont invités à revoir l'ensemble des valeurs calculées</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>La conclusion n'est pas pertinente</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Juste harmoniser les références selon la norme APA</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):

L'article suit une structure académique classique (IMRAD) et apporte des données locales pertinentes pour Madagascar. Cependant, plusieurs points méritent d'être affinés pour améliorer la rigueur scientifique et la clarté.

Il faut reconnaître que les erreurs sur le calcul des odds ratios et ses intervalles de confiance font perdre la valeur scientifique de l'article.

La taille de l'échantillon est petite pour donner une puissance statistique

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: