

Paper: “Étude de l’effet antidépresseur de la décoction des rhizomes de *Cyperus Articulatus* (Cyperaceae) sur les souris blanches *Mus musculus* Swiss (Muridae)”

Submitted: 09 February 2022

Accepted: 23 June 2022

Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Yvonne Asta Madi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n21p151](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n21p151)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Badoussi Marius Eric

Université Nationale des Sciences, Technologies, Ingénierie et Mathématiques, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Rachid Ismaili

Hassan Premier Settati, Maroc

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: RACHID ISMAILI	
University/Country: Hassan premier Settat -Maroc	
Date Manuscript Received:08/04/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/04/2022
Manuscript Title: Etude de l'effet antidépresseur de la décoction des rhizomes de <i>Cyperus articulatus</i> (Cyperaceae) sur les souris blanches <i>Mus musculus</i> Swiss (Muridae).	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	4
<i>NO comments</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Yes</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Il faut chercher des références bibliographiques plus récentes</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.	2
<i>La conclusion est courte il faut l'élargir d'avantage. Il faut ajouter des perspectives de l'étude.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Il faut refaire la bibliographie en utilisant des références bibliographiques plus récentes (au maximum 5 ans d'ancienneté).</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

NO

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

NO

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: BADOUSSE Marius Eric	
University/Country: Université Nationale des Sciences, Technologies, Ingénierie et Mathématiques/Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/05/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/05/2022
Manuscript Title: Etude de l'effet antidépresseur de la décoction des rhizomes de <i>Cyperus articulatus</i> (Cyperaceae) sur les souris blanches <i>Mus musculus</i> Swiss (Muridae).	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 63.02.2022	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<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>	
Le manuscrit est bien rédigé et contient peu de fautes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Voir mes commentaires dans le corps du manuscrit	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<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>	
La conclusion est en accords avec le contenu du manuscrit	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: