



Paper: “Neuroanatomical interpretation of Peter Paul Rubens’s copy of „The Battle of Anghiari” by Leonardo da Vinci”

Corresponding Author: Grigol Keshelava

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n14p8

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Iddrisu Yussif
Tamale Technical University, Ghana

Published: 31.05.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: Mr. IDDRISU Yussif	Email:
University/Country: Tamale Technical University/Ghana	
Date Manuscript Received: 09/05/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/05/2020
Manuscript Title: Neuroanatomical interpretation of ‘The Battle of Anghiari’ by Leonardo da Vinci	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0462/20	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(The topic has been stated clearly and it is good enough for the research paper)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(The researchers need to have a second look at their abstract. The reason is that,</i>	

<i>the methodology and results of the research work are missing in this vital area of their paper. Remember that an abstract presents your problem formulation, methods and main results and describes how the research makes a difference in a given field in less than half a page.)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Grammatical errors and spelling mistakes cannot be found in the manuscript)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>(This section describes the method or methods the researchers used to answer the question(s) raised in their problem formulation. Their information concerning methods should both allow the reader to assess the validity of their results. Finally, they should also describe which analytical methods they have used.)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(The conclusions section is where the researchers need to summarize their answer(s) to the questions posed in their research problem formulation. What is the strongest statement you can make based on your findings?) However, this has not been done</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(The style of reference is appropriate but not comprehensive)</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: