

**Paper: “Hernie Diaphragmatique Congenitale Droite de Diagnostic Tardif-A  
Propos d’une Observation”**

**Submitted: 02 November 2022**

**Accepted: 30 December 2022**

**Published: 31 December 2022**

Corresponding Author: Moussa Kalli

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p417](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p417)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oumarou Youssouff, République centrafricaine

Reviewer 2: Blinded

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022*

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.  
***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: YOUSOUF	
University/Country: République centrafricaine	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/12/2022
<b>Manuscript Title: HERNIE DIAPHRAGMATIQUE CONGENITALE DROITE DE DIAGNOSTIC TARDIF. A PROPOS D'UNE OBSERVATION ET REVUE DE LA LITTERATURE.</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: 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Il est n'est necessaire que la revue de la litterature figure dans le titre. Le titre doit annoncer le travail propre des auteurs.</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Il manque quelques details importantes, telles que les quotations de l'appréciation de l'état general, de l'amaigrissement et de la conscience.  Les image radiologiques de la suite opératoire et de l'état Clinique satisfaisante de l'enfant manquantes.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**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):**