Paper: "**Tocotrienol-Rich Fraction Of Palm Oil Attenuates Type II Collagen-Induced Temporomandibular Joint Rheumatoid Arthritis In Rats For Future Clinical Application**"

Corresponding Author: Ahmed S. Ahmed

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr Koné Boake

Reviewer 2: Blinded

# 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: Dr KONÉ BOAKE | Email: |
| University/Country: | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 21/07/2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: 29/07/2020 |
| Manuscript Title: | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 75.06.2020-second submission | |
| 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 <br><br> 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.**

| *Questions* | *Rating Result* <br> [Poor] **1-5** <br> [Excellent] |
|---|---|
| **1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.** | **4** |
| *The title of this article is clear and indeed matches the content.* | |
| **2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.** | **4** |
| *The summary is fairly clear and presents the objects, methods and results.* | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.** | **5** |
| *Grammatical and spelling mistakes are non-existent.* | |
| **4. The study methods are explained clearly.** | **3** |
| *The study methods are not clearly explained and are not very consistent with Figure 1.* | |
| **5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.** | **4** |
| *The body of the paper is fairly clear and contains no errors.* | |
| **6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.** | **4** |
| *The conclusions or summary are correct and supported by the content of the article.* | |
| **7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.** | **5** |
| *References are complete and appropriate.* | |

## 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):
*We believe that the methodological approach implies greater clarity and must be in line with the illustrations.*


## Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: