

Paper: “Teneur en Composés Phénoliques et Activités Antioxydantes de Sargassum fluitans et Sargassum natans, deux Algues Brunes Invasives des Côtes Ivoiriennes”

Submitted: 06 September 2022

Accepted: 28 October 2022

Published: 31 October 2022

Corresponding Author: Fatioualabi Bouraima

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p294

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: BENE Kouadio, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Dramane SORO, Université Peleforo Gon COULIBALY/ Côte d’Ivoire

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: BENE Kouadio	
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript : 06/10/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/10/2022
Manuscript Title: Received: Teneur en composés phénoliques et activités antioxydantes de <i>Sargassum fluitans</i> et <i>Sargassum natans</i> , deux algues brunes invasives des côtes ivoiriennes	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0965/22	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No comment	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Some values to insert	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Few grammar and spelling mistakes Remarks are in the manuscript	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> See the manuscript	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> See the manuscript	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> See the manuscript	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The bibliographic reference must be harmonized: abbreviation or not of the names of the journals, volume and pagination, italics or not of the names of the journals, Authors in the biblio reference do not appear in the text and vice versa</i> <i>See the manuscript</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):

The manuscript may be published after some corrections

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Nothing to report.

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: Dramane SORO	
University/Country: Université Peleforo Gon COULIBALY/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 05 octobre 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 10 Octobre 2022
Manuscript Teneur en composés phénoliques et activités antioxydantes de <i>Sargassum fluitans</i> et <i>Sargassum natans</i> , deux algues brunes invasives des côtes ivoiriennes	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0965/22	
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.	5
The title of this article is clear and is adequate with the content.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
This article is well rewrite with few mistakes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Yes</i> , The study methods are explained clearly	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Yes</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>No</i> . He has to work on the summary again, since the results do not appear well in his summary	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>yes</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):

No Comments and suggestions for author

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No Comments and suggestions for Editor