

**Paper: “Formulation et Fabrication des Suppositoires à Visée Antipaludique à Base du Beurre de Karité Contenant Artémisia annua Cultivé à L’ouest Cameroun”**

**Submitted: 08 June 2022**

**Accepted: 11 August 2022**

**Published: 31 August 2022**

Corresponding Author: Clautaire Mwebi Ekengoue

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p207](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p207)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Akmel Meless Siméon  
Université Alassane Ouattara, Bouaké

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Keita Youssouf Faya  
Université des Sciences, des Techniques et des Technologies de Bamako, Mali

# 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: 10/06/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/06/2022
Manuscript Title: Formulation et fabrication des suppositoires antipaludiques d'Artémisia annua d'Ouest Cameroun en utilisant le beurre de karité comme excipient	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0630/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>

<p><i>The tittle should be rewritten : suggestion : Formulation et fabrication des suppositoires à visée antipaludique à base beurre de karité contenant <i>Artémisia annua</i> cultivée dans l'Ouest Cameroun</i></p> <p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<p><b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b></p>	<p><b>2</b></p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<p><b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b></p>	<p><b>1</b></p>
<p><i>It seems the manuscript haven't been attentively red and corrected. (Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<p><b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b></p>	<p><b>2</b></p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<p><b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b></p>	<p><b>2</b></p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<p><b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b></p>	<p><b>2</b></p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<p><b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b></p>	<p><b>1</b></p>
<p><i>The references should be updated (Please insert your comments)</i></p>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

To rewrite the tittle

To reconstruct the arguments in favor of suppositories dosage form compared to the commonly used galenic presentations

Some experiments carried out as physicochemical characterizations of *Artemisia annua* powder are not fully justified, for instance, what is the relevance of studying the particle size of the powder? Tapped density?

Method chapter should be clearly written as well as the results chapter

Overall, the manuscript lacks rigorous construction and the countless grammar and syntax errors are unacceptable at this level. In addition, many bibliographical references are outdated.

### **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!***

Reviewer Name:	
University/Country: Mali/West Africa	
Date Manuscript Received: 17:06:22	Date Review Report Submitted:
<b>Manuscript Title: <i>Formulation et fabrication des suppositoires antipaludiques d'Artémisia annua d'Ouest Cameroun en utilisant le beurre de karité comme excipient</i></b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 30.06.2022	
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>(Il est compréhensible pour le lecteur)</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Il présente une synthèse correcte des activités menées)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Il y a quelques erreurs grammaticales qui ne nuisent en rien le contenu du texte.)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(La méthodologie permet de comprendre les différentes étapes et les matériels à utiliser)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(les résultats sont présentés selon les points énumérés en méthodologie)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Relate brièvement les faits et les résultats obtenus )</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Blanco e tal, 2020 (Page 14) dernier paragraphe et Liversside, 1981 (Page 4 fin paragraphe) manquent dans les références)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>4</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

**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!*

Reviewer Name: AKMEL Meless Siméon	
University/Country: Université Alassane Ouattara (Bouaké)	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/06/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 29.06/22
Manuscript Title: <b>Formulation et fabrication des suppositoires antipaludiques d'Artémisia annua d'Ouest Cameroun en utilisant le beurre de karité comme excipient</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0630/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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]

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Sujet d'actualité, mais à reformuler	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Problème de précision, à revoir</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Des problèmes de forme à revoir	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthodologie est à revoir (voir remarques)	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> L'absence d'objectifs spécifiques ne permet pas de saisir vos resultants. De plus vous ne présentez pas les données avant de les commenter. Revoir en présentant d'abord les tableaux puis commentez ou analyses les.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Assez bien présentée</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  Assez bien présentées	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	



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

Voir les observations

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