

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: March 29 th , 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: April 7 th , 2017
Manuscript Title:	
Evaluacion de tres niveles de mananos oligosacáridos (<i>Sacharomices Cerevisae</i>) en los parámetros productivos y salud intestinal en pollos de engorde en el cantón Babahoyo, Provincia De Los Ríos, Ecuador	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

Evaluation Criteria:X

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>The title is very clear and appropriate, however there are some content issues in terms of how the data is shown in the article. For instance, the information shown in the tables is the same as in the figures, so it should be one or the other, but not both.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>The abstract in Spanish is well structured, but the English version does not read well.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>Minors mistakes trough out the document</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>All the aspects regarding methodology are in the article, however there are not well put together in paragraph fashion, therefore reading can be bugging at times.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>The structure of the manuscript needs some formatting. At times the reading becomes confusing due to the structure of this manuscript. In mi opinion, some paragraphs need to be put together for better understanding.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>The summary needs some work. The English translation does not read properly.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>References can be updated, but they ones used are comprehensive and appropriate for the results and the conclusions in this study.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The changes that need to be made to the article are just cosmetics, meaning editing. The article is very interesting, but it needs to read better.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The article needs some major editing to do in terms of structuring the article in a more reading friendly manner. Other than that, the article is good.