
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:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Relation entre les facteurs socio-économiques et l'anémie au cours de la grossesse (Nouakchott – Mauritanie)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Yes the title is clear enough	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The abstract is good	5
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>Some minor spelling errors need correction</i>	5

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> This is a retrospective well designed study	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The conclusion reflects the study and its results	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>Some need completion</i>	

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):

Read carefully and correct some spelling errors and complete the reference

(Anémie en Tunisie: Causes et Mesures d'Intervention, 2002 :50,71) with authors and journal name

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This study is original and will add a major input to the exploration of anemia in Mauritania

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

