

Paper: "Evaluation de L'Efficacite Antimicrobienne des Gels Hydroalcooliques Vendus sur les Marches et Grandes Surfaces de la Ville de Daloa (Centre-Ouest, Cote d'Ivoire)"

Submitted: 14 November 2022 Accepted: 28 November 2023 Published: 30 November 2023

Corresponding Author: Coulibaly Bakary

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n33p214

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Bosson Antoine Kouame Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: 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!

Date Manuscript Received:22 /02/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/02/2023		
Manuscript Title: EVALUATION DE HYDROALCOOLIQUES VENDUS SUR LES MARCH (CENTRE-OUEST, COTE D'IVOIRE)	L'EFFICACITE ANTIMICROBIENNE DES GELS LES ET GRANDES SURFACES DE LA VILLE DE DALOA		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1179/22			
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No No			
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No Yes			
You approve, this review report is available in the	ne "review history" of the paper: Yes/No 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.

	Rating Result
Questions	[Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3.5
the title does not include the notion of an investigation on the s	ubject in the city of

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
Yes the summary presents clearly objects, methods and results	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	Yes, 3
There are spelling mistakes in the article.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	Yes, 4
The study methods are good	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	Yes, 4
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	Yes, 5
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	Yes, 4
(Please insert your comments)	

## $\textbf{Overall Recommendation} \ (\text{mark an } X \ \text{with your recommendation}):$

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

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**