

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: 6 july	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 12 july
Manuscript Title: Importance économique des espèces fruitières sauvages comestibles en zone Kasa (Sud-ouest du Sénégal)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0740/18	

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.	4
<i>It could be better shaped on the purpose of the paper (ie: outline in two words what is this importance)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>No. The abstract clearly states "what" but follows no one of the scholarly accepted abstract formats, therefore the paper is basically useless for researcher because hardly indexed. Beside there are no clear and intriguing keywords.</i>	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>Good clear French. Elegant.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Absolutely inadequate and a mere list of products. There is no clear explanation of the qualitative or quantitav ie methods, statistic system, or whatever. Referring to the title "what is the importance...?" The methodologie gives no hints about this and qualitatively asks nothing.</i>	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>It is as clear as useless. Beside, nothing more than a compendium.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>No. it is not clear, really, what the authors have carried over.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	1
<i>Inadequate. Only two minor titles are recent (2016 and 2017) all the rest is outdated (data older than 50 years!)</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

