# **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 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!

Date Manuscript Received: 04.09.2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 04.12.2018		
Manuscript Title: Effect of the essential oil of Clausena anisata (Rutaceae) and palm kernel			
vegetable oil on engorged females of three species of Ixodidae cattle ticks.			
ESJ Manuscript Number: 101.04.2018			

## **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.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The article evaluate effectively the effect of palm kernel and a mixture different dilutions) with a palm kernel on three species of ticks compared	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<ul> <li>(An explanation is recommendable)</li> <li>The three components (purpose, methods and results) are presents in</li> <li>3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</li> </ul>	the abstract
(a brief explanation is recommendable) Author must read back the manuscript in order to correct grammatic	al errors and syntax.
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
(An explanation is recommendable) See the track changes for corrections	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
(An explanation is recommendable)	
See comments in track changes	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
(An explanation is recommendable) Not comment	
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>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Formats in-text Citations and the reference list are not in accordance with APA web site https://libguides.williams.edu/citing/apa#s-lg-box-12803415)	A citation style (see

#### **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):**

1- Use ESJ template 2017 to format your manuscript (use simple space).

2-Translation of the manuscript from French to English must be improved.

3- Formats in-text Citations and the reference list are not in accordance with APA citation style (see web site https://libguides.williams.edu/citing/apa#s-lg-box-12803415).

4-Important comments related to the main text can be seen directly in the manuscript (Word track changes)

5-In the discussion, authors must cleary give their view/opinion on their results and their meaning. They must establish a link between their results and what is stated in the discussion.

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

1-Make sure that authors observed APA citation style (for in-text citations and reference list)

2-Return me the manuscript after correction for last review.





