

Manuscript: “**Contribution to the Diagnostic Study of Intestinal Parasitosis, Haiti**”

Submitted: 15 April 2021

Accepted: 21 May 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Evens Emmanuel

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n17p64

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Souad Belamalem, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Aurela Saliq, University of Vlora, Albania

Reviewer 3: Judith Exantus, Universite d’Etat d’Haiti, Haiti

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/04/2021
Manuscript Title: CONTRIBUTION TO THE DIAGNOSTIC STUDY OF INTESTINAL PARASITOSIS, HAITI	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0483/21	
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.	4
<i>a little bit too long</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

The abstract is brief, it usually presents the main parts of the article	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>It's good</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methodology of this work is clear; comprehensive, it brings a lot of information	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
it's clear	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>the conclusion is too long to reduce</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
it's well written	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This manuscript is clear, rich in information, methodology well explained. It meets scientific standards so it will require subsequent publication in your journal after the corrections that I submitted you.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 17-04-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 22-04-2021
Manuscript Title: Contribution to the diagnostic study of intestinal parasitosis from January 2018-2019 at Fermathe hospital, Haiti.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 83.04.2021.	
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 “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

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 title is clear and represents clearly the article’s content.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract contains the entire necessary elements, although there aren’t divided into sections. If the abstract were presented in divided section, it would have been more comprehensible.</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>I have not noticed grammatical errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study population and methods are explained clearly and with sufficient details. This is a cross-sectional study, conducted in more than 600 correctly evaluated subjects. Data analysis is performed with accurate and up-to-date statistical methods.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results' section is merged with the discussion's one, and I would prefer they were divided. Anyway, the prevalence of parasitosis and their influencing factors that could possibly impact it are described with details and proper statistical analyses. These results are correctly compared with other studies in this field.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are clear and accurate. The recommendations are evidence based as well.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are generally suitable: there are sufficient updated articles mentioned in this section. It's only that the way they are formatted should be more appropriate.</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):

You should present more proper formatted references. It's difficult to distinguish them from each-other.

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: Judith Exantus	
University/Country: Universite d'Etat d'Haiti / Haiti	
Date Manuscript Received: 04-22-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 5/3/2021
Manuscript Title: CONTRIBUTION TO THE DIAGNOSTIC STUDY OF INTESTINAL PARASITOSIS FROM JANUARY 2018-2019 AT FERMATHE HOSPITAL, HAITI	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0483/21	
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 “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
I suggest to review the title regarding the period	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The abstract is written clearly and the different parts are found throughout the abstract section</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Please review the third line of the second paragraph of the Methods (something is missing).</p> <p>In the first line of the Results Discussion, please correct “The results related” instead of “relate”</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The methods are well and clearly explained. A small thing to review is mentioned in the 3rd section (mistake). Please do not mention the N 207 in the Methods</p> <p>I think it will be more comprehensive for the reader if you explain for example what do you mean by Eau miracle</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Please review the third line of the first paragraph by removing the “or” preceding percentage. You can simply put the value in parenthesis right after the number 207.</p> <p>Please give us the age interval.</p> <p>Please put “the” before second is <i>Blastocystis hominis</i> (The most common intestinal parasite is <i>Endolimax nana</i> (39.13%) and second is <i>Blastocystis hominis</i>..)</p> <p>I think it would be more easy for the reader to present 2 tables instead of the table 1. Like Having a table for one parasite in the stools and the second for the association of parasites. The fact of finding 2 or 3 parasites in the stools of the same person should allow you to raise opinions also about the ability to recognize them I think.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Conclusion accurate and coherent to the document</p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p><i>Appropriate references and Many recent papers are referenced.</i></p>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

A relevant paper discussing a problem chronic in the low-middle income countries. Some review has to be done before publishing of your paper. Please take time to read the comments.