

Manuscript: “**Etude Phytochimique et Activité Antioxydante des Extraits D’écorces de Tiges de Vitellaria Paradoxa C.F.Gaertn, Une Plante Médicinale Utilisée au Nord de la Côte d’Ivoire**”

Submitted: 26 July 2021

Accepted: 23 September 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Tidiane Kamagaté

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p241

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abdelfettah Maouni, Abdelmalek Essaadi University, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Randrianavony Patricia, University of Antananarivo, Madagascar

Reviewer 3: Lrhorfi Lalla Aicha, Ibn Tofail

Reviewer 4: Dembele Daouda, Université des Sciences, des Techniques et des Technologies de Bamako, Mali

Reviewer 5: Blinded

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: Abdelfettah MAOUNI	
University/Country: Abdelmalek Essaadi University- Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 02/09/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 03/09/2021
Manuscript Title: Composition phytochimique et évaluation de l'activité anti-oxydante des extraits de Vitellaria Paradoxa C.F.Gaertn (Sapotaceae), une plante médicinale utilisée dans le Nord de la Côte d'Ivoire.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0825/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: 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.	4
<i>Okay, mais revoir quelques modification- Voir le corrigé du manuscrit</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>A revoir les résultats de l'activité antioxydante- Voir le corrigé du manuscrit</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Oui – Voir le corrigé du manuscrit</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Non – A revoir Tubes ou CCM Voir le corrigé du manuscrit</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>Not clair: A revoir les résultats CI50</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Veillez voir le corrigé de votre article en pièces jointes

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: RANDRIANAVONY Patricia	Email:
University/Country: University of Antananarivo, Madagascar	
Date Manuscript Received: 9-9-21	Date Review Report Submitted: 9-11-21
Manuscript Title: Composition phytochimique et évaluation de l'activité anti-oxydante des extraits de Vitellaria Paradoxa C.F.Gaertn (Sapotaceae), une plante médicinale utilisée dans le Nord de la Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 25.08.2021	
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 is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes are found in this article, and need to be corrected</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study methods are well explained</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Results are clear, no errors, but error of the mean should be included in the graph</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion is accurate and supported by the conten</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate, but writing in the list should be corrected</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):

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: Lrhorfi Lalla Aicha	
University/Country: Ibn Tofail	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/09/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/09/2021
Manuscript Title: Composition phytochimique et évaluation de l'activité anti-oxydante des extraits de <i>Vitellaria Paradoxa</i> C.F.Gaertn (Sapotaceae), une plante médicinale utilisée dans le Nord de la Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0825 /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.	4
<i>The title summarizes the content of the article well</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results except, however ecart-error for data inhibitory concentration values are very high and units are not noted</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are some errors, that authors must correct</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Not so. in the result part, authors spoke of a screening of secondary metabolites with TLC and this is not the case</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>In the case of Figure 1, the author has to work with a concentration range of 0-100 mg / mL and not with 0-100 mg / mL for the fig. be clearer and that we can compare the 3 solutions, namely the two extracts and the vit.C</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Indeed, the conclusion put in evidence the significant points of the article</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Clearly, the references are well appropriate</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The main remarks are made at the level of the result part: the values of CI are not very reliable with a very high ecart-error and figure 1 is not clearly presented. You can find more details about my remarks in the 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: DEMBELE Daouda	
University/Country: Université des Sciences, des Techniques et des Technologies de Bamako, MALI	
Date Manuscript Received: 02 septembre 2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Composition phytochimique et évaluation de l'activité anti-oxydante des extraits de <i>Vitellaria Paradoxa</i> C.F.Gaertn (<i>Sapotaceae</i>), une plante médicinale utilisée dans le Nord de la Côte d'Ivoire.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0825/21	
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.	2
<i>Le titre a besoin d'être plus précis</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Le résumé a besoin d'être plus conçu avec des reformulations simples et précises.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Les fautes grammaticales et fautes d'orthographe sont à corriger</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>La méthodologie décrite a besoin d'être plus précise et claire</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Évidemment mais ils ont besoin d'être plus organisés avec des reformulations plus précises. La discussion à côté va aider aisément la compréhension par le lecteur</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>A réviser pour être plus adapté au contexte</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Certaines références sont vieilles et méritent d'être remplacées par des récentes</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Améliorer le contenu du projet d'article et le faire lire par des littéraires avant de le soumettre.