



Paper: “Epidémiologie de Diarrhée des Veaux dans les Troupeaux Bovins au Sud du Togo”

Corresponding Author: Kotoe Mensah

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n27p313

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Seme Kpassi, University Of Lomé/Togo

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Koffi Joseph N'guessan Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny (Abidjan Côte d'Ivoire)

Published: 30.09.2020

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: SEME Kpassi | Email: |
| University/Country: University of Lomé/Togo | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 10 avril 2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: 22 avril 2020 |
| Manuscript Title: Epidémiologie de la diarrhée des veaux dans les troupeaux bovins au Sud du Togo | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 42.04.2020 | |
| 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. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</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): No comments

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: N'GUESSAN K. Joseph | |
| University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny (Abidjan Côte d'Ivoire) | |
| Date Manuscript Received:07/05/2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: 16/05/2020 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Manuscript Title: Epidémiologie de Diarrhée des Veaux dans les Troupeaux Bovins au Sud du Togo | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0442/20 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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. | 3,5 |
| <p><i>-Il faut poser clairement le probleme dans l'introduction en insitant sur le taux de prevalence dans le monde, en Afrique et Afrique de l'ouest.car c'est une étude épidémiologique.</i></p> <p><i>-Elucider le type d'enquête au niveau de la method.</i></p> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 5 |
| (RAS) | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 5 |
| (RAS) | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 3 |
| <p><i>-Constitution des troupeaux expérimentaux dépourvue de références pour validation</i></p> <p><i>-Indicateurs épidémiologiques dépourvus également de references</i></p> | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 2,5 |
| <p><i>Pas clair car le matériel et les methodes sont imbriqués, le logiciel de traitement de données pas expliqué et pas de matériel technique. Aussi la discussion c'est pas un rappel de resultats mais plutôt des explications de ces resultats validés par ceux des auteurs connus.Discussion trop longue pour peu de resultats. Il faut commencer la discussion à partir de "Au regard des different modes ...jusqu'à la fin ".Enfin il faut supprimer tableaux et Figures dans la discussion.</i></p> | |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 5 |
| <i>(RAS)</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 1,5 |
| <i>NON. Propositions voir pièce jointe</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):