

Manuscript: “**Effets De *Cyperus Articulatus L. (Cyperaceae)* Sur La Memoire Des Souris Blanches Suisses (*Mus Musculus Swiss.*)**”

**Submitted: 11 July 2020**

**Accepted: 09 September 2020**

**Published: 31 August 2021**

Corresponding Author: Salomon Taah Yamndou

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n29p184

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Diomandé Souleymane

URF des Sciences de la Nature, Université Nangui Abrogoua, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

**Reviewer 2:** Ehouman Evans

Independent Researcher, Côte d’Ivoire

# ***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: Ehouman Evans  |  |
| University/Country: Independent Researcher/Côte d’Ivoire  |  |
| Date Manuscript Received: 27/08/2020  | Date Review Report Submitted: 01/09/2020 |
| Manuscript Title: EFFETS DE <i>CYPERUS ARTICULATUS</i> SUR LA MEMOIRE DES SOURIS BLANCHES ( <i>MUS MUSCULUS</i> SWISS)    |  |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0780/20  |  |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <del>No</del>  |  |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ <del>No</del> |  |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ <del>No</del>                     |  |

## **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>Rating Result</b><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>  |
| <i>The title is clear and match with the content of the article</i>                          |   |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>                        | <b>3</b>  |
| <i>The abstract, clearly presents the object, the methods used and the results obtained.</i> |   |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <i>The figure number not matching with the figure referenced in the text.</i>  |          |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| <i>We only noticed spacing mistakes with punctuation marks</i>   |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <i>The study methods are clearly explained and respect the field standard. However, there is no reference for Pharmacological Tests methods. And no precision if those methods are newly established by the authors.</i>                                 |          |
| <b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| <i>The document has few errors.</i>  |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>The conclusions of the paper are accurate</i>   |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| <i>Some references are not correctly referenced in the reference section. However, they are appropriate and comprehensive. They only need to be updated. In fact, for such an important topic, it may be interesting to have more recent references.</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):**

This paper was very interesting to read. Your topic is of a great interest and I congratulate you for the job you did.

The abstract clearly recalls the main findings. The introduction defines the domain of investigation and the problematic to resolve. Methodology is clearly explained and reproducible, despite the fact that some sections need to be referenced. The results are graphically illustrated and well commented. All the results obtained match with the methodology presented.

As I commented in the manuscript:

- The results of the Phytochemical screening study should be presented in the

results section instead of in the conclusion section;

- The pictures design could be harmonized. Moreover, from figure 3 to the last picture, the number of the figures is not respected. Unit of dose should be added on figure X- axis (time s) and Y-axis (dose mg/kg);
- Two post-hoc tests are used but they are not mentioned in the result section;
- The references in-text and in the refence section should also be conformed to the style (APA) you have chosen. Some automatic reference managers such as Mendeley, Zotero, EndNote, ..., could be used to deal with citations;
- Minor errors, only spacing errors with punctuations marks noticed;
- With no clinical test it is difficult to affirm that the pharmacological effects of the plant are due to the plant extract, however they **may** be due to it;
- The discussion could also be oriented to other plants belonging *Cyperus* genus. Moreover, the results obtained could be explained based on the phytochemical compounds present in your plant extracts. Thus, you could recall the phytochemical screening results to explain the pharmacological observations in your discussion. The pharmacological observations may be due to some of the phytochemical compounds present in the plants extract. Further analysis may permit to fraction the extract and determine the effective fraction acting as memory activator.

You did a very interesting work, congratulation the team.