

Manuscript: “**Prevalence Des Infections Parasitaires Dues Aux Protozoaires Identifies Au Laboratoire National De Biologie Clinique Et De Sante Publique, Bangui Republique Centrafricaine**”

**Submitted: 02 January 2021**

**Accepted: 24 May 2021**

**Published: 30 June 2021**

Corresponding Author: Freddy Marcelin Agboko

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n21p115

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Alpha Seydou YARO, Université des Sciences, des Techniques et Technologies de Bamako (USTTB)/Bamako

**Reviewer 2:** Blinded

**Reviewer 3:** Assovié Koco Rita Nadège, Université Alassane Ouattara de Bouaké, Côte d’Ivoire

# ***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: Alpha Seydou YARO	Email:
University/Country: Université des Sciences, des Techniques et Technologies de Bamako (USTTB)/Bamako	
Date Manuscript Received: January 11th , 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: January 12, 2021
Manuscript Title: <b>PREVALENCE DES INFECTIONS PARASITAIRES DUES AUX PROTOZOAIRES IDENTIFIES AU LABORATOIRE NATIONAL DE BIOLOGIE CLINIQUE ET DE SANTE PUBLIQUE, BANGUI REPUBLIQUE CENTRAFRICAINE.</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ESJ_37.01.2021	
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	
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.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Acceptable title	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Abstract should be improved	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes there are grammatical errors	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> acceptable	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>1.5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Results need comments and interpretations	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Poor conclusion, it need to be improved	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>1.5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Poor references and badly reported	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>X</b>
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

- The results section have to be improved by including comment for each result and interpretation
- The references are wrongly written in both the document text and in the references list.

# ***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: Assovié Koco Rita Nadège	Email:
University/Country: Université Alassane Ouattara de Bouaké, Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 12 janvier 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 01 février 2021
Manuscript Title: <b>PREVALENCE OF PARASITIC INFECTIONS DUE TO PROTOZOA IDENTIFIED AT THE NATIONAL LABORATORY OF CLINICAL BIOLOGY AND PUBLIC HEALTH, BANGUI CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0137/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
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.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
the title is clear and adapted to the content of the article	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Yes, the abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>this article contains spelling and grammatical mistakes the corrections have been made directly in the document also some suggestions</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Yes, the study methods are explained clearly</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>the results are clear but there is a mistake in the title of a table</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Yes, the conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Yes, the references are comprehensive and appropriate</b>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The article is good, but a few small corrections need to be made before publication. It informs us about parasitic infections that are due to the environment in which we live, thus a challenge to health and hygiene.