

**Paper: “Peritonite Biliaire Primitive Chez l’Enfant : À Propos de Deux Cas au CHUD Borgou-Alibori, Parakou”**

**Submitted: 21 August 2024**

**Accepted: 28 November 2024**

**Published: 31 December 2024**

Corresponding Author: Edwige Lawin

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n36p100](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n36p100)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Moussa Kalli  
Universite de N’Djamena, Tchad

Reviewer 2: Choua Ouchemi  
University of N’Djaména, Tchad

Reviewer 3: Magloire Dingamnodji  
UNABA, Tchad

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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: MOUSSA KALLI	
University/Country: UNIVERSITE DE N'DJAMENA/ TCHAD	
Date Manuscript Received: 7 /10/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/10/2024
Manuscript Title: PERITONITE BILIAIRE PRIMITIVE CHEZ L'ENFANT: A PROPOS DE DEUX CAS AU CHUD BORGOU-ALIBORI, PARAKOU	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0936/24	
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>	4
<i>TITRE CLAIR CLAIR ET CONCIS</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	4
<i>QUELQUES COQUILLES GRAMMATICLAES PRESENTER L IMAGE DE L 'ASP</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	4
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	4
<i>METHODOLOGIE BIEN CONDUIT, LES CAS SONT BIEN PRESENTES</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>SANS COMMENTAIRES</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>VEILLEZ SUIVRE LE GUIDE DE REFERENCES ESJ VOS REFERENCES NE RESPECTENT PAS LES NORMES</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):**

**Rapport des cas , bien présenté , discussion bien conduit et agreeable à lire**

**Retravailler les references**

**LES MOTS ou phrase SOULIGNés en rouges : c est à dire supprimer**

**Vert : suggestion**

**JAUNE OU ORANGE : ALERTE**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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: CHOUA Ouchemi	
University/Country: University of N'Djaména, TCHAD	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>PERITONITE BILIAIRE PRIMITIVE CHEZ L'ENFANT : A PROPOS DE DEUX CAS AU CHUD BORGOU-ALIBORI, PARAKOU</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 09 360924	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Yes, the title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Yes, the abstract presents objects, methods, and results of the case reports.</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Yes, there are very few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Yes, the study methods are explained clearly.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Yes, the results are clear and do not contain errors.</i>	

<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Yes, the conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Yes, the references are comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Travail bien écrit et facile à lire. Révisions mineures dans l'écriture de quelques références.**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**