

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

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 report. 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. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. 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!***

Date Manuscript Received: 04.23.2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 04.25.2018
Manuscript Title: Effect of the essential oil of <i>Clausena anisata</i> (Rutaceae) and palm kernel vegetable oil on engorged females of three species of Ixodidae cattle ticks	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 101.04.2018	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an 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.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The article evaluate effectively the effect of palm kernel and a mixture of <i>C. anisata</i> (at different dilutions) with a palm kernel on three species of ticks compared to flumethrin.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The three components (purpose, methods and results) are presents in the abstract	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> A last proofreading of the manuscript by an English-speaker is necessary before any publication	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> No comment	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> All in-text citations are not in APA style	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> No comment	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. <i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> All citations are not in APA style	

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):

1- Discussions did not approach how such combination of the essential oil with palm kernel could be used in real conditions on cattle. The other question that can be asked in the discussion is the cost of using this combination under real conditions according to dilutions. The author must discuss these aspects.

2- Some in-text Citations are not in accordance with APA citation style (see web site <https://libguides.williams.edu/citing/apa#s-lg-box-12803415>).

3- Comments related to the main text can be seen directly in the manuscript (Word track changes).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

1-A last proofreading is necessary

2-Make sure that authors observed APA citation style (for in-text citations)

3-Return me the manuscript after correction for approval.