

---

# 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: 10/03/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 15/03/2017
Manuscript Title: <b>Effet <i>In Vivo</i> De <i>Newbouldia Laevis</i> Sur Des Strongles Gastro-Intestinaux Des Moutons</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: -102.03.2017	

## 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The title reflect the content of the manuscript	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The Abstract contain the objective of the study, a brief summary of the methodology, some important results (i.e. important features should be given), some conclusions drawn from the important features.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>OK</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
The methods used should be clearly stated. - Author should indicate the reference (if any) of the methods used. - A subtitle "Statistical analysis" should be provided (if applicable). The statistical method or test(s) used (if any) should be provided under this section.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>OK</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>OK</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
Author should check to make sure that all the references cited in the text are properly listed at the Reference section, and that all the references listed at the Reference section are properly cited in the text.	

**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 author(s) should seek help from a native speaker of the language used.

- All the units, except %, should be separated from the values. e.g. 70 °C, 6.0 g, 24.3 mL, 37%.

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