



**Paper: “Ethnobotanical Study Of Medicinal Plants In The Fight Against Buruli Ulcer In The Maritime Region Of Togo”**

Corresponding Author: Tchalaré Makagni

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n27p239

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Prof. Raoufou, Radji, University of Lome, Togo

Reviewer 2: Mohammed Mouradi, Sultan Moulay Slimane (SMS) University, Morocco

Published: 30.09.2020

# ***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: Prof. Raoufou, Radji	Email:
University/Country: University of Lome, Togo	
Date Manuscript Received: 23 June 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 24 June 2020
Manuscript Title: Ethnobotanical study of medicinal plants in the fight against Buruli ulcer in the Maritime region of Togo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 84.04.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No <b>YES</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<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>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>But the abstract can be completed by the period of the study for more credibility of the paper.</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Comments and suggestions are made into the text.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Methodology needs to be more concise</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>See comments and suggestions in the manuscript. Table 1 is too clumpy. Authors can present more than only one table for better understanding</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Lack first idea that summarize the study. See comments on the text</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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

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

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

Comments and suggestions are available on the manuscript. To be take into account for resubmission.