

Manuscript: “**Etude Comparative des Toxicités Cellulaires et Aigües de Ageratum conyzoides L. et de Acanthospermum hispidum DC**”

Submitted: 30 July 2020

Accepted: 16 August 2021

Published: 30 November 2021

Corresponding Author: Camara Djeneb

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n40p74

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Patricia Randrianavony, University of Antananarivo, Madagascar

Reviewer 2: Adéréwa A. M. Amontcha Yabi, Université d'Abomey-Calavi

Reviewer 3: Kouadio Bene, Nangui Abrogoua University

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: University of Antananarivo, MADAGASCAR | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 21-08-05 | Date Review Report Submitted: 21- 08-07 |
| Manuscript Title: Etude comparative des toxicités cellulaires et aigües de Ageratum conyzoides L. et de Acanthospermum hispidum DC. | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 36. 08. 2021 | |
| 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 of this paper is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |
| <i>The abstract clearly presents objects, and the methods used in the work as well as the results</i> | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <i>few grammatical errors are found in the paper</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>Methods used in this study are explained clearly</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>results are clear and do not contain errors</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>Conclusion is accurate and supported by the content</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>references are comprehensive and appropriate, but contains few errors</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It's an interesting paper

Few errors in materials and methods, results and references need to be corrected.

They don't influence the quality of the work

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Adéréwa A. M. AMONTCHA YABI | |
| University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 05/08/2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 10/08/2021 |
| Manuscript Title: Étude comparative des toxicités cellulaires et aigües de <i>Ageratum conyzoides</i> L. et de <i>Acanthospermum hispidum</i> DC. | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 36.08.2021 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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> | <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>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and | 5 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| results. | |
| <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> | |
| Quelques petites erreurs de formulations ont été soulignées | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Veillez revoir l'agencement des idées dans l'introduction. L'argumentaire n'est pas très convaincant. La raison justificative de l'étude n'est claire.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Kouadio BENE | |
| University/Country: NANGUI ABROGOUA University | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 10/08/2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: |
| Manuscript Title: Etude comparative des toxicités cellulaires et aigües de <i>Ageratum conyzoides</i> L. et de <i>Acanthospermum hispidum</i> DC. | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0836/21 | |
| 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>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le sujet est d'actualité et très intéressant avec un contenu fidèle au libellé | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résumé présente clairement les objectifs, les méthodes et les résultats. | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le texte est bien écrit avec peu de fautes de grammaire et d'orthographe | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthodologie est clairement expliquée | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le corps du manuscrit a un style simple et clair et contient très peu d'erreurs. | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La conclusion est bien faite. | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Certaines parutions de la bibliographie sont un peu ancienne à mon avis (exemple : 1935, 1977, 1987, 1988, ...), merci de trouver des auteurs plus récents (si possible)</i> <i>Les autres remarques sont dans le manuscrit.</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):

Les remarques sont dans le manuscrit.

Le manuscrit peut être publié après quelques corrections.