

Manuscript: “**Etude Phytochimique Des Écorces De Racines Et Des Feuilles De Securidaca longipedunculata (Fresen), Polygalaceae Au Mali**”

**Submitted: 03 June 2021**

**Accepted: 06 July 2021**

**Published: 31 August 2021**

Corresponding Author: Dembele Daouda L.

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n29p145

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Dr. Sokame Bonoukpoè Mawuko  
ICIPE, Kenya

**Reviewer 2:** Blinded

**Reviewer 3:** Mengome Line Edwige  
Institut de Pharmacopée et de Médecine Traditionnelle (IPHAMETRA/CENAREST)

# ***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!***

<b>Reviewer Name:</b> Dr. <b>SOKAME Bonoukpòè Mawuko</b>	
University/Country: <i>icipe/ Kenya</i>	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/06/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/06/2021
Manuscript Title: Phytochemical study of root bark and leaves of <i>Securidaca longipedunculata</i> (Fresen), Polygalaceae in Mali	
<b>ESJ Manuscript Number:</b> 0648/21	
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>	<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> The title is very clear.	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>All sections are represented</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>Many sentence structures need to be reviewed</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The study methods are clear but need more explanation (confer to the text)</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Result are well presented but with some comments (confer to the text)</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>The conclusion is not accurate</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Many references are too old and need to be reviewed.	

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

No-one

# ***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:	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 07 June 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 13 June 2021
Manuscript Title: Etude phytochimique des écorces de racines et des feuilles de <i>Securidaca longipedunculata</i> (Fresen), Polygalaceae au Mali.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 48. 06. 2021 (1)	
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:    No	
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>	<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>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The title is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Fews grammatical errors to be corrected</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Study methods are clear</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Results are clear, no errors</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>There are some points in Conclusions which are not supported by the content</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>References list need to be checked</i>	

**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):**

Some points in results and discussion need to be checked to enable you to draw the conclusion in this article

# ***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: MENGOME Line Edwige	
University/Country: Institut de Pharmacopée et de Médecine Traditionnelle (IPHAMETRA/CENAREST)	
Date Manuscript Received: 1er juillet 2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>Etude phytochimique des écorces de racines et des feuilles de <i>Securidaca longipedunculata</i> (Fresen), Polygalaceae au Mali</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0648/21	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The content of this manuscript is adequate to the title.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>Summary is clearly and presents the different sections of this article.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Spelling and grammar are correct in this articles.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Methods studies are explained clearly.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Results are clear without errors.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The conclusion is little light after such results.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The presentation of reference must be to standardized and added recent references.</i></li> <li>- <i>Cited the references in the order of appearance in the article and put the numbers, or you put them in alphabetical order and you remove the numbers.</i></li> </ul>	

**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):**

I suggest you add recent references (2018 – 2021) especially in the discussion. Present the references in a single form of citation.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

It is an acceptable article. Authors should add recent references in the discussion and standardize the presentation of citations.

