

Manuscript: “**Production Locale De Médicaments Issus De La Médecine Et Pharmacopée Traditionnelles : Analyse Des Déterminants De La Survie De L’unité De Production (UPHARMA)**”

Submitted: 22 November 2020

Accepted: 28 December 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: Salfo Ouédraogo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n36p374

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Patricia Randrianavony
Antananarivo, Madagascar

Reviewer 2: Elisée Kporou Kouassi,
Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé Daloa, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Komlavi Esseh, Togo

Reviewer 4: Blinded

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: Patricia RANDRIANAVONY	
University/Country: Antananarivo/MADAGASCAR	
Date Manuscript Received: 11/27/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 11-28-2020
Manuscript Title: Production locale de médicaments issus de la médecine pharmacopée traditionnelle : Analyse des potentielles contraintes et les conditions de succès d'une unité de production de phytomédicaments (U-PHARMA) au Burkina-Faso	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 29.12.20	
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.

<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.	5
<i>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results, but there is no need to put subtitle</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes, but they don't affect the article content</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Methods used in this study is clearly explained</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Results are clear</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Conclusion and summary are accurate, and they are supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>References are appropriate, but they should be writing correctly in the text and in</i>	

the list

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is an interesting investigation which can help to improve the structure of research centers in Africa.

References should be revised

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 12.27.20		Date Review Report Submitted: 12.30.20
Manuscript Title: Production locale de médicaments issus de la médecine pharmacopée traditionnelle : Analyse des potentielles contraintes et les conditions de succès d'une unité de production de phytomédicaments (U-PHARMA) au Burkina-Faso.		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1229/20		
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NO		
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.

<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.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Title is too long, the authors have to propose a short title in maximum of 2 lines	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract has to be rewritten integrating some methods used but not mentioned.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Several grammatical errors to correct. They were put in red in the text for some ones.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Some confusions appeared about description of some methods used. They were mentioned in the text	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Somme repetitions of results were observed. The authors have to delete these repetitions in the treatment of data	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The problem treated by this paper was clear and solutions proposed were clearly elaborated and justified. The conclusion focused on this.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Enormous efforts have to be done about this section. They were not well presented and cited in the text. The references were not sufficient.</i>	

--

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Some questions are mentioned on the paper. Would you please give answers to these questions in separate file to help me understand your methodology.

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: ESSEH Komlavi	
University/Country: TOGO	
Date Manuscript Received: 27 Nov 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 07 Dec 2020
Manuscript Title: Production locale de médicaments issus de la médecine pharmacopée traditionnelle : Analyse des potentielles contraintes et les conditions de succès d'une unité de production de phyto-médicaments (U-PHARMA) au Burkina-Faso.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 29_12_2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES
 You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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.

<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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Partie à réorganiser entièrement</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Prendre en consideration les remarques.