ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

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: **Edelin Lucene Mangnan**	

University/Country: **American University of the Caribbean (AUC) / Haïti**	

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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
The title is perfectly clear in that it respects the rules and principles of scientific writing while arousing a certain curiosity. In reading the article, we could see a progression in the contents and the title in question.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
The abstract is well developed with precise details on how the topic will be	

developed. The objects, methods and results are presented in a precise and concise manner.

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The grammatical errors are very few and are only found in the indications at the bottom of the tables and figures. Either a capital letter after a period, or a spacing that is not too serious. *For example, on page 16: "This is digital information. on the RG-Score," capital O* *Page 7: "social network with, arguably," after "with" a semicolon should have been used instead of a period. Not serious mistakes at all.*	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The author has used precise methods that accurately study and analyze the validity of the concepts and variables studied. In particular, he has used the tools of scientometrics, either bibliometrics or almetrics, to clarify his approach.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results in the text are defined in a simplistic way, with supporting tables and graphs. After reviewing the results, they were found to be correct and accurate.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusion gives a fairly accurate idea of the main objective of the subject and the whole text gives the impression that everything has been said, analyzed and justified.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references are appropriate and arranged in alphabetical order. They are both complete and also correspond perfectly to each quotation in the text.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The subject is well done and respects the rules and fundamental principles of scientific writing. However, the author is asked to pay attention to punctuation and spacing in the statistical indicators. This is not a big deal, because usually the analysis software generates the results in this way.

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: Silvere Paul Nuiro	
University/Country:Université des Antilles, Guadeloupe (FWI)	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/04/21	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/07/2021
Manuscript Title: Use of almetric and bibliometric indicators to measure scientific productivity in the fields of life and earth sciences: case study from Haiti	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0453/21	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
The title is clear and appropriate to the content of the article, as it highlights the content of the work. The keywords are present to indicate to the reader the intended purpose.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**

The abstract summarizes the content of this article, pointing out the statistical analysis tools used and the different sources of data analyzed to arrive at the results obtained.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
There are a number of corrections to be made in form and spelling throughout the document. In particular, there are confusions with the word "altmetric", which is correct, and the words "altimetric" and "almeric", only the former should be used. There are also sentences that need to be revised, such as the one after Figure 1.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
The methods used are well explained and sufficiently detailed to understand their use. The choice of methods is relevant to the desired conclusions. The source of the data used is clearly mentioned.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
The results are well presented and are rigorous. The software tools are appropriate and the analysis of the software renderings is rigorous and sufficiently detailed.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
The conclusions are well listed and adapted to the results demonstrated in this article. The perspectives for future developments are interesting and well mentioned. The interest of the work is also well highlighted.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
The list of bibliographical references is sufficiently extensive and of good quality. The different aspects of the work are based on solid published works.	

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): I invite the authors to make all formal corrections (spelling and grammar) in order to improve the quality of the writing of the document. This necessary effort will allow the publication of this work which is really of good quality.