

Paper: "Importance Socioéconomique et Ethnomédicinale de Haematostaphis barteri Hook F. dans les Localités de Bidzar, Figuil, Boula-ibbi et Lagam, Nord-Cameroun"

Submitted: 11 July 2022 Accepted: 11 August 2022 Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Tsobou Roger

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p227

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mamadou Abdoulaye Konare Université des Sciences, des Techniques et des Technologies de Bamako (USTTB), Mali

Reviewer 2: 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!

Reviewer Name:					
University/Country: Université des Sciences, des Techniques et des Technologies de Bamako (USTTB) / Mali.					
Date Manuscript Received: July, 24th 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: July, 25 <sup>th</sup> 2022				
Manuscript Title: Importance socioéconomique et ethnomédicinale de Haematostaphis barteri Hook F. dans les localités de Bidzar, Figuil, Boula-ibbi et Lagam, Nord-Cameroun					
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0740/22					
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: <b>Yes</b>					
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.

	Rating Result
Questions	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4			
(Please insert your comments)				
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3			
The abstract needs to be rewrite. It is too long and isn't well some results come before methods	structured. Because			
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3			
Text needs to be read.				
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3			
This section must be rearranged. We found some parts in the Sometimes references aren't mentioned (for more details, (pl comments into the manuscript).				
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3			
Authors should review this part. Their comments are too long main ideas in few sentences.	g they can try to say			
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3			
(Please refer to my comments and corrections inside the mar	uscript)			
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4			
Many references (69), which mean authors did a deep read of literature. But this section needs also small corrections (see in my comments). There are also some references who are not so relevant Authors should try to reduce that section				

## 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):**

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: