
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

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: 20/11/2018	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/11/2018
Manuscript Title: PREVALENCIA DE PARASITISMO INTESTINAL Y SU ASOCIACION CON EL ESTADO NUTRICIONAL EN NIÑOS DEL MUNICIPIO DE GALAPA, ATLÁNTICO-COLOMBIA, 2017	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 39.11.2018	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No NO	
You approve your name as a reviewer of this paper is available on the ESJ's website: Yes/No 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. (Remove the year of the title clarify it in materials and methods)	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. (Needs revision)	3
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
To see comments in text	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Needs revision)</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Needs revision)</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):

To see comments in text

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The work improved a lot. The suggestions sent were followed. I believe that once the new corrections have been made, the work can be published.

Sincerely

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

