

**Paper: “Les Tanins et les Flavonoïdes dans l'Activité Anthelminthique in Vivo et in Vitro de Newbouldia Laevis et Zanthoxylum Zanthoxyloïdes sur les Vers Adultes de Haemonchus Contortus”**

**Submitted: 31 October 2022**

**Accepted: 24 December 2022**

**Published: 31 December 2022**

Corresponding Author: Erick Virgile Bertrand Azando

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p328

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr Georcelin ALOWANOGoueU

Reviewer 2: Koffi Mesmin

Reviewer 3:

## Dr Georcelin ALOWANOGoueU

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-11-24 11:39 AM

Recommendation: Accept Submission

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

**\* The title of the manuscript is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article**

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

**\* The abstract is well written. It presents clearly background, objects, methods and results**

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Not applicable

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The study methods are explained clearly in a comprehensive sentences

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

**\* The body of the paper is clear and follows the guideline of the journal**

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

**\* The conclusion is accurate and supported by the content**

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

**\* The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate. moreover all authors mentioned in the text are referenced**

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

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

Not applicate

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

We recommend the editors to give a great consideration to this manuscript

## Koffi Mesmin

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-12-01 08:25 PM

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\* The title does not clearly convey the content of the article.

The author tells us about the involvement of tannins in the in vivo and in vitro deworming activities of two plants, so nowhere was the content of tannins and flavonoids in the extracts of these plants mentioned.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

**\* Objects are not clearly presented. The methodology is presented in a vague way as much as the results. It is difficult to understand the work after reading the summary.**

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

There are some grammatical and spelling errors in this article, but these cannot, however, call into question the work.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

**\* It is there, in the part of the methodology that there is a problem. A good part of the methodology is quoted without however being in adequacy with the title. The methodology itself on the deworming activities of plant extracts, which represents the heart of the book, the author has contented himself with listing the methods without describing them. So much so that in the results section, the resulting comments are difficult to understand. There is also the fact that the author speaks for example of the dosage of polyphenols, tannins and flavonoids and when we come to the results, we do not see anywhere the result of the levels of these compounds in the plant extracts.**

**The methodology part should be reviewed, including the results and the discussion. In the Discussion part the author presents only the work of the previous authors without really highlighting the value of his results.**

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

**\* The body of the document is clear and does not contain errors**

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

**\* The conclusion and the summary leaves the readers in ramble.**

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

**\* Citations present in the body of the document are not found in the list of references and vice versa. Also, it is not necessary to cite numerous sources for a single sentence. One or two, at most three, is enough.**

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

**\***

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*



- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

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

The author deals with a topical subject concerning the question of digestive strongyloses. Only the methodology as presented did not facilitate the understanding of this excellent subject. The work seems very colossal, however the author has not sufficiently valued his

research. For example, you mentioned the dosage of polyphenols and tannins, but in the results presented, there is not a paragraph on the content of these compounds. The document as presented seems to have been drafted in haste. I think you have had very good results, specify the methodology used and value your results obtained.

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

Dear editors, in recent years there has been an improvement in the way you evaluate the various draft articles submitted to you. I encourage you to continue and even to go beyond. I dare to hope that you will take into account the observations made by the reviewers to produce quality publications. Thank you for the consideration and my apologies for the delay. Thanks!