



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: **“Pregnancy in a Woman With Untreated Vesico-Cloacal Extrophy: A Clinical Case”**

Submitted: 10 April 2026

Accepted: 26 June 2026

Published: 30 June 2026

Corresponding Author: Gilles-Davy Kossa-Ko-Ouakoua

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n18p48

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Adriana Gherbon
University of Medicine and Pharmacy Timisoara, Romania

Reviewer 2: Ngaguene Juvenal
Université Paris Cité et Sorbonne University; France

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: NGAGUENE JUVENAL	
University, Country: Université Paris Cité et Sorbonne University; France	
Date Manuscript Received: 04. 05. 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 07.05.2026
Manuscript Title: PREGNANCY IN A WOMAN WITH UNTREATED VESICO-CLOACAL EXTROPHY: A CLINICAL CASE	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree that 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 for the content of the article.	4
Pregnancy in a Woman with Untreated Vesico-Cloacal Exstrophy: A Case Report <i>Le titre est clair, concis et globalement adapté à un rapport de cas. Il reflète correctement la pathologie et le type d'étude. De légères améliorations peuvent être apportées concernant l'uniformisation terminologique et les standards rédactionnels de la revue.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	3
Le résumé suit globalement la structure d'un case report, mais manque de rigueur scientifique et de précision terminologique. Plusieurs expressions non standard sont utilisées et la méthodologie reste peu explicite. Les résultats cliniques sont correctement décrits mais la présentation scientifique doit être améliorée.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Nécessité de précision méthodologique	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
clairs et compréhensibles,. Cependant, certaines descriptions anatomiques et cliniques manquent de précision. Au total; cliniquement pertinent	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Reflète le sujet mais reste très global	
Il est important de la spécifier	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Cf Vancouver maximum 11 references</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):

Il s'agit d' un cas rare qui présente une importance Clinique mais nécessite des révisions avant publication. Les principales limites concernent l'imprécision diagnostique au sein du spectre exstrophie-épispadias, ainsi qu'une stratégie chirurgicale insuffisamment justifiée et détaillée. Le manuscrit requiert également une amélioration importante de la qualité rédactionnelle et de la terminologie médicale. Les aspects éthiques, notamment le consentement éclairé doivent être clairement documentés. La discussion doit être renforcée par une revue de littérature actualisée et une analyse critique plus approfondie des options thérapeutiques et des résultats à long terme.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: