

Paper: **“Trematodes of the Genus Mesocoelium, Parasites of Anurans in the Ganzourgou Province, Burkina Faso”**

Corresponding Author: Magloire Boungou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n18p347

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kenko Nkontcheu, University of Buea, Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Maha Ali Abdel Latif National Centre for research

Reviewer 3: Devang Upadhyay, The University of North Carolina at Pembroke, NC, USA

Reviewer 4: Belamalem Souad,

Published: 30.06.2020

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

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!***

Reviewer Name: Maha Ali Abdel Latif	
University/Country: National centre for research	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/5/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/5/2020
Manuscript Title: Trematodes of the genus <i>Mesocoelium</i> , parasites of Anurans in the province of Ganzourgou in Burkina Faso.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0609/20</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: 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.**

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
Rewrite title to reflect aim of the work e.g <b>An inventory of Trematodes of the genus <i>Mesocoelium</i>, parasites of Anurans in the province of Ganzourgou in Burkina Faso.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Experimental design is not clear</li> <li>2. Environmental parameter such as temperature, relative humidity must be added</li> <li>3. Methods to collect nematodes must be written in separate paragraph.</li> </ol>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
Minor errors were observed	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
Need some corrections (mentioned above)	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
Minor errors	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
It is ok	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
It is ok	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>yes</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

1. Rewrite the article title
2. Rewrite methodology by adding statistical design and trematodes collection method

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

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

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!***

Reviewer Name: Devang Upadhyay	Email:
University/Country: The University of North Carolina at Pembroke, NC, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: May 18, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: May 31, 2020
Manuscript Title: Trematodes of the genus Mesocoelium, parasites of Anurans in the province of Ganzourgou in Burkina Faso.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 09.06.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: 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.**

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>Title could be more specific related to their work or experiments they have conducted</i></p> <p><i>Like; recovery of Trematodes, isolation of..., Infestation study of .....</i></p>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Abstract represents the objects but the purpose of the study could be explained along with that. Methods and results are stated overall and conclude the findings. The technique of isolation process could be added.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Authors need to work on Passive voice usage, word choice and proper formatting. Very few spelling mistakes</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Authors have mentioned study sites and sampling process in detailed. Although, the methods could be more clarified with additional methods or process about prevalence rate or infestation study instead of citing a reference. It could be more useful for readers.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The format/body of the manuscript is proper and written in a right flow. Introduction part could have some figures of trematodes and Anurans</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Conclusion sounds very similar to abstract. Need to rewrite. Authors could emphasis on benefits/application of this study as well as future required investigation/objects</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Enough references have been cited to support this study, proper formatted. Recent reports are also included</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

Please improve title and conclusion with suggested information as well as more detail about methods for infestation study. Need more proofreading for better grammatical format.

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

Please accept this manuscript after suggested corrections. This information can be useful for readers/researchers to study about Trematodes or infestation in Anurans in their area.