

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: 13 August 2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 21 August 2018
Manuscript Title: Synthesis and Characterization of Alumina-Chitosan-Hydroxyapatite Biocomposites for Load Bearing Application	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 62-07-2018	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an 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>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The Authors should be rewriting the keywords as indicated in the manuscript by green color and they have must remove the words in color red.	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The Authors should be rewriting some words as indicated in the manuscript by green color and They have must remove some words as indicated in color red. The Authors should be added the references in the introduction.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> Just some errors as indicated in the manuscript by the red color (remove) and green color	

(added) Added on introduction of this party regrouping the results obtained in the tables 2, 3... and the figures or plats???	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. <i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i> The Authors should be rewriting all references as the instructions indicating by the journal such as indicated the manuscript by green color and They have must remove some words as indicated in color red. The Authors should be added the recent references	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript entitled: “Synthesis and Characterization of Alumina-Chitosan-Hydroxyapatite Biocomposites for Load Bearing Application”

The manuscript is well written and well respected the instructions indicated by the Journal EJS, except that it seems to me the Authors must rephrase a few sentences because the originality of the present work is of the order of **59%** and that of plagiarism is the order of **41%**. This requires this work, in my point of view, a major correction before publication.

The Authors must correct the remarks which are indicated by the colors green (to be added) and red (to be eliminated).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

