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 teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 28 october 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 30 october 2017
Manuscript Title: Relation entre les facteurs socio-économiques et l'anémie au cours de la grossesse (Nouakchott – Mauritanie)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 149.06.2017	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-lesspoint rating.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(abrief explanationis recommendable) The title of the study definite well the problematic and makes take out again all components and the main axes the constituent.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
(abrief explanationis recommendable) The abstract gives a general view on work and clearly reflect the content of the article project. And in the same sense the graphical abstracts give clear ideas on the results gotten at the end of this work.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
(abrief explanationis recommendable) Fiew errors (see yellow color in the body text)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**

(abrief explanationis recommendable) The protocol that is driven during this work answers the needs of this kind of study. It takes account of all components bound to the search by covering all factors impacting anemia in Nouakchott.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4**
(abrief explanationis recommendable) Work is structured well, and contains in succession the following parts: Title - Abstract- key Words (to complet by Mauritania… for example) - Introduction - Methodology - Results and Discussion - Conclusion - - References - and table The o**bjective** is **clearly mentioned** at the end of the introduction; The authors bring us in this work of the interesting results according to a continuation logical and discriminating of stages: collection and treatment of the data by suitable methods. Statistics are very correct. The results are discussed in light of the international publications and the previous studies. They confirm and already agree with the hypothesis advanced.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
(abrief explanationis recommendable) The conclusion is very explanatory and gives the real and true situation in Mauritania concerning anemia the evolution of thi diseases related to the sociodmographic factors. The recommendation of the author was, in this paper, focused on the needed strategies especially nutritional and health education.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
(a brief explanationis recommendable) Paper is well documented but there is some old references relating at the domain; some recent are needed.	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Key words are not complet. Must be completed by adding th name of country and other significant words:
- Its appear tht there is a luck Acknowledgements sentences;
- Paper is well documented but there is some references relating to the domain need to be updated : some recent are needed.

Thus**, t**he insertion of certain references are needed because of the papers touch the heart of the problem in North Africa related to the ‘‘Obe-Maghreb ‘‘Project realized in Morocco and Tunisia from 2007 to 2011

(CORUS2), for example.

Below some references that I suggest to verify and if possible ti integrate in the discussion of this paper :

- Gartner A, El Ati J, Traissac P, Bour A, Berger J, Landais E, El Hsaïni H, Ben Rayana C, Delpeuch F. (**2014)** A double burden of overall or central adiposity and anemia or iron deficiency is prevalent but with little socioeconomic patterning among Moroccan and Tunisian urban women. Journal of Nutrition. 144(1):87-97
- Gartner A, Berger J, Bour A, El Ati J, Traissac P, Landais E, El Kabbaj S, Delpeuch F. (**2013**) Assessment of iron deficiency in the context of the **obesity** epidemic: importance of correcting serum ferritin concentrations for inflammation. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 98(3):821-6
- Landais Perrin E., Bour A, Holsworth M., Gartner A. Delpeuch F. et coll. (**2014)** "Socio-economic and behavioural determinants of fruit and vegetable intake in Moroccan women". http://journals.cambridge.org/PHN . Journal of Nutrition. 144(1):87-97
- Jafri A, Bour A, Belhouari A, Delpeuch F, Deouriche A ; Malnutrition among housewives and their children in North-east Casablanca, Morocco ; Nutr. clin. diet. hosp. 2012; 32(supl. 2): 65-69

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Acknowledgments are needed to be insered if recommended by chief editor of your paper office.