

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: 24.03.2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 29.03.2017
Manuscript Title:	
Facterus de risque et aspects cliniques de la mémorisaiton peropérateur dans un pays sub-saharien	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1857-7881	

Evaluation Criteria:

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> Réveil peropérateur et memorisation dans un pays sub saharien: prévalence et facteurs de risque ??? à revoir parce que facteur de risqué avec un si petit nombre ...	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>reprendre methods et résumer</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>Il reste des erreurs grammaticales multiples, des % à revoir dans les tableaux, des ponctuations qui manquent, des abbreviations non expliquées... a revoir de manière rigoureuse</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>On ne parvient pas à savoir quand l'évaluation a été réévaluée</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>À revoir</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>Le caractère urgent est souvent synonyme d'hypotension, de circonstances difficiles: les cas repertoriés devraient faire l'objet d'une description plus précise.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable) Première référence: sans objet pour l'article</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Le sujet est intéressant, le groupe important. Il faut clarifier plusieurs points, corriger le français et les erreurs

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Potentiel mais à bien revoir

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

