
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

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 report. 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. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper.

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!

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Date Manuscript Received: 17/01/2018 | Date Manuscript Review Submitted: |
| Manuscript Title: | |
| Can advanced maternal age negatively impact on the prognosis of the birth? Observational study at the Issaka Gazoby maternity center in Niamey, Niger | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 05.02.2018 | |

Evaluation Criteria:

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

| Questions | Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|---|--|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 3 |
| <i>The title is clear and adapted to the content of the text</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |
| <i>It is found in the summary, the essential elements like the objectives, the methodology and the results</i> | |
| 3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 3 |
| <i>The text is written with grammatical errors. The propositions of the passages to be reformulated are highlighted in yellow</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 3 |
| <i>The methodology is well described, but requires clarification a major issue is the method of calculating the number of cases</i> | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 3 |
| <i>The body of the text is clear and understandable</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>The conclusion and the summary are adapted to the text</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. (All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa) | 3 |
| <i>There are some references to review</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: