
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

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: NGNASSI DJAMI Aslain Brisco	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/01/19	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/01/19
Manuscript Title: Enquête Sur Les Farines Céréalières Et <u>Des</u> (Les) Ingrédients Utilisés Dans La Préparation De La Pâte Appelée "Tôh" A Abidjan (Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0163/19	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the published version of the paper: Yes/No	

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.

<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. See text in red	3
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. See text in red	3
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. See text in red	3
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

See text in red	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
See text in red	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
See text in red	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
See text in red	

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 authors are held to integrate all the corrections suggested in order to pass to the validation of this article.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Thanks you for taking me as a reviewer

