

Paper: “Étude Anatomo-Hystopathologique du Tractus Digestif des Poulets Bicyclettes Infectés par la Maladie de Newcastle dans les Fermes en Côte d’Ivoire”

Submitted: 28 August 2023

Accepted: 06 October 2023

Published: 31 October 2023

Corresponding Author: Mahn Camille Yoro

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n30p145

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Louis Stevens Aimé
Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Cote d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Auguste Denise Mambé Boye
Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Daouda Dembele
USTTB, Mali

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: AIME LOUIS STEVENS	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/08/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/08/2023
Manuscript Title: Etude Anatomopathologique Et Histopathologique Du Tractus Digestif Des poulets Bicyclettes Infectés Par La Maladie De Newcastle Dans Les Fermes En Côte D'ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0820/23	
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.	3
Oui, il y a une adéquation entre le titre et le contenu	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
Non, les étapes ne sont pas respectées Introduction; Matériel et méthodes; Les résultats clés; Discussion; conclusion	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
oui	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Pas vraiment, certaines méthodes restent à être bien expliquées	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>OUI</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>Non, il y a quelques désaccords</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>OUI</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: BOYE Mambé Auguste-Denise	
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/09/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/09/2023
Manuscript Title: Etude anatomopathologique et histopathologique du tractus digestif des poulets bicyclettes infectés par la maladie de Newcastle dans les fermes en Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0820/23	
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
<i>(Au regard de la méthodologie et des résultats obtenus, le titre est adapté au contenu de l'article. Toutefois, il a été légèrement modifié pour être précis, les expériences n'étant pas faites sur toute l'étendue du territoire ivoirien. Si le nombre de fermes investiguées est inférieur à trois, prière de les citer, dans le cas contraire maintenir l'expression "certaines fermes")</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2,5
<i>Le résumé comprend les différentes parties à savoir: objectifs, méthodes et résultats. Mais, il serait judicieux de faire le résumé en un seul bloc. Des observations et remarques sont faites dans l'article.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3,5
<i>Il y a peu d'erreurs grammaticales et de fautes d'orthographe dans cet article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2,5
<i>Les méthodes d'étude sont expliquées clairement mais le matériel d'étude n'est pas précis</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>Les figures 1C et 1E ne sont pas très claires, il y'a une absence de la photo 1F, aussi les contours pour marquer les observations doivent être mis en gras</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Les conclusions ou le résumé sont exacts et étayés par le contenu.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>7. Les références sont complètes et appropriées; toutefois des corrections dans la formes sont nécessaires pour cadrer avec les norms de la revue</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Je recommande à l'auteur de prendre en compte les observations faites dans le document afin de faciliter la validation de son article.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: Je suggère à l'équipe éditoriale de faire parvenir en même temps que l'article, le guide de rédaction afin de faciliter la correction de l'article. Aussi, je propose qu'une attestation de d'évaluateur soit donnée au correcteur afin de le motiver dans l'évaluation des articles.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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 DEMBELE Daouda	
University/Country: USTTB/Mali	
Date Manuscript Received: 9-9-2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 24-9-2023
Manuscript Title: Etude Anatomo-hystopathologique Du Tractus Digestif Des poulets Bicyclettes Infectés Par La Maladie De Newcastle Dans Les Fermes En Côte D'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0820/23	
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>Rating Result</i>
<i>Questions</i>	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>Le titre peut être amélioré en englobant les études anatomopathologique et histologique par Anatomico-histopathologique</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>Le résumé est à revoir et adapter au contenu du manuscrit</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>La grammaire peut être améliorée</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>La Méthode est compréhensible et adaptée</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Les résultats sont encourageants</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>La conclusion peut être améliorée</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Les références sont à adapter aux directives de la revue</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

A corriger et à faire lire par un littéraire pour la version finale.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: