
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend as part of the revision.

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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 02 feb 2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Revue des doses d'exposition et des méthodes d'optimisation en tomographie (TDM) de l'enfant au Togo.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0260/16	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Needs thorough restructuring. It is not appearing as an abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4,5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Proper research gap should be identified	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4,5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This sheet is to be returned to the author(s) of the manuscript. Please provide reasons for acceptance or rejection as well as any suggestions that you might feel are appropriate for revisions or improvements.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Some mistakes :

- **In authors : Médicale not médicale**
- In Résumé :
 - Méthodologie : **“colligées”** not colligés
 - Résultats : 2nd line : the word **“examens”** must be cancelled; 4th line :
ad **“la”** to Guide du Bon Usage de...Société Française
- In Introduction : 6th line : **“générale”** not general

- In Discussion :
 - 2nd paragraph, 6th line, the sentence beginning by “la difference entre....” is too long. Two sentences can be made
 - 4th paragraph, first line : “**prescrites**” not prescrit, “**réalisées**” not realizes and “**suivies**” not suivis
 - 7th paragraph, first line : “**nous**” not “non”
 - 10th paragraph, 2nd line “**abdomino-pelviennes**” not abdomino-pelviens; 3rd line “**facial**” not faciale
 -
- In Conclusion : 4th line : “**françaises**” not français