

Manuscript: “**Etude Histologique Des Organes Excreteurs Du Poulet De Races Dzaye Et Bochibolochie En Cote D’ivoire**”

Submitted: 20 December 2021

Accepted: 01 February 2022

Published: 28 February 2022

Corresponding Author: **Mahn Camille Yoro**

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n8p40

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Rachid Ismaili,

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: Rachid ISMAILI | |
| University/Country: Morocco | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 07/09/21 | Date Review Report Submitted: 08/09/21 |
| Manuscript Title: ETUDE HISTOLOGIQUE DES ORGANES EXCRETEURS DU POULET <i>Gallus gallus</i> DE RACES DZAYE ET BOCHIBOLOCHIE EN COTE D'IVOIRE. | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: | |
| 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] |
|--|---|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 4 |
| <i>Je propose de supprimer l'expression gallus gallus:</i> ETUDE HISTOLOGIQUE DES ORGANES EXCRETEURS DU POULET DE RACES DZAYE ET BOCHIBOLOCHIE EN COTE D'IVOIRE. | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |
| <i>No comments</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 3 |
| | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 3 |
| <i>Pour la méthode histologique : il faut chercher des références bibliographiques plus récentes et essayer donc de changer cette référence qui date de 1967.</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 5 |
| | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 3 |
| <i>IL faut ajouter des perspectives pour ce travail de recherche (cela va ajouter plus de valeur à vos travaux)</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>Il faut essayer de changer les références bibliographiques anciennes par des références plus récentes.</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 and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No