

Paper: “Effets de L’extrait Aqueux des Racines d’Hymenocardia acida (Euphorbiaceae) sur la Qualité du Sperme de Rats”

Submitted: 14 March 2022

Accepted: 27 July 2022

Published: 31 July 2022

Corresponding Author: Emile Kouassi Begbin

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n24p248

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Affy Mataphouet Emmanuel
Alassane Ouattara University, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Lébri Marius
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Abidjan Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Anouar Alami
Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University, Fes, Morocco

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 02/06/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/06/2022
Manuscript Title: Effets de l'extrait aqueux des racines de <i>Hymenocardia acida</i> (Euphorbiaceae) sur la qualité du sperme de rats	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0360/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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>Oui le titre est claire et il correspond au contenu de l'article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>Oui le résumé prend en compte les différentes parties (objectifs, méthodes et résultats)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>acceptable pas de fautes grammaticales majeures</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Dans l'ensemble la méthodologie est claire</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Les résultats sont dans l'ensemble explicites</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Oui la conclusion est claire</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Il faut ajouter certaines références (herbier, méthode d'extraction)</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):

Le manuscrit est bien rédigé dans l'ensemble, facile à lire. Cependant il faut ajouter quelques références (herbier, méthode d'extraction et préciser le lieu où les études sur le sperme ont été effectuées)

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Je recommande ce manuscrit pour publication avec des révisions mineures

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: AFFY MATAPHOUET EMMANUEL	
University/Country: ALASSANE OUATTARA UNIVERSITY/ CÔTE D'IVOIRE-BOUAKE	
Date Manuscript Received: 02/06/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/06/2022
Manuscript Title: Effects of aqueous extract of <i>Hymenocardia acida</i> (Euphorbiaceae) roots on the quality of rat semen	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0360/22	
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.	3
<i>there are few grammatical errors</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>some parts need to be more explicit</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<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>	
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):

Bring out the interest of the subject in the introduction. Others observations are mentioned in this present manuscript

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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!

Date Manuscript Received: June 20, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: June 27, 2022
Manuscript Title: Effects of aqueous extract of <i>Hymenocardia acida</i> (Euphorbiaceae) roots on the quality of rat semen	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0360/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.	
<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>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
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>	
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	
Accepted, minor revision needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

About 44% of this document consists of text more or less similar to the content of the sources considered most relevant by iThenticate. The authors are expected to reduce this plagiarism rate below 25%.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

About 44% of this document consists of text more or less similar to the content of the sources considered most relevant by iThenticate. The authors are expected to reduce this plagiarism rate below 25%.