

Manuscript: “**Principes Actifs Et Mise En Evidence Des Sucres Des Aubergines Solanum Anguivi Lam Et Solanum Torvum Récoltées En Côte d’Ivoire**”

**Submitted: 18 March 2021**

**Accepted: 01 May 2021**

**Published: 30 June 2021**

Corresponding Author: Dan Chépo Ghislaine

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n21p33

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Blinded

**Reviewer 2:** Lrhorfi Lalla Aicha, Ibn Tofail University, Morocco

# ***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: Lrhorfi Lalla Aicha   |  |
| University/Country: Ibn Tofail university/Morocco  |  |
| Date Manuscript Received: 16/04/2021   | Date Review Report Submitted: 21/04/2021 |
| <b>Manuscript Title: Principes Actifs et Mise en Evidence des Sucres des Aubergines<br/> <i>Solanum anguivi Lam et Solanum torvum Récoltées en Côte d'Ivoire</i></b> |  |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0404/21   |  |
| 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><br>[Poor] 1-5<br>[Excellent] |
|--|---|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| The title summarizes the content of the article                                |   |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| The abstract clearly presents methods and results but the objectives are not mentioned   |          |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| There are some errors that must be corrected   |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| A whole part of the method of identifying sugars is missing  |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| Indeed, the conclusion put in evidence the significant points of the article and is well supported by the content of the text. |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| Clearly, the references are well understood and appropriate, however to avoid errors of form                                   |          |

**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):**

You will find my remarks in the article