

Paper: “Étude Toxicologique et Effet Antianémique d’Un Complément Alimentaire à Base de Feuilles de *Jatropha gossypifolia* chez des Rats Wistar”

Submitted: 29 August 2022

Accepted: 10 January 2023

Published: 31 January 2023

Corresponding Author: Bleu Gomé Michel

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n3p90](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n3p90)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Daouda Dembele

Reviewer 2: Raimanth Ogougbe

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: DEMBELE Daouda	
University/Country: MALI	
Date Manuscript Received: 10-12-2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 21-12-2022
Manuscript Title: Etude toxicologique et effet antianémique d'un complément alimentaire à base de feuilles de <i>Jatropha gossypifolia</i> chez des rats Wistar	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0937/22	
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.	2

L'intitulé du titre peut être amélioré pour plus de précision et pour mieux l'adapter au contexte au vu des résultats obtenus	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>Le résumé peut être amélioré en révisant l'objectif, précisant avec clarté la démarche méthodologique et en mettant un accent sur les résultats clés permettant de répondre à l'objectif.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>La grammaire peut être améliorée en évitant les phrases trop longues qui ne permettent pas une compréhension facile aux lecteurs</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>La description de la démarche méthodologique peut être plus explicite afin de mieux la suivre.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>La présentation des résultats peut être améliorée. Cependant la partie screening phytochimique consacrés aux métabolites secondaires dont les effets thérapeutiques sont connus et bien documentés ne traitent pas l'objectif du travail qui traite aussi la nutrition. Il serait mieux que ce soit des métabolites primaires (glucides, lipides, protéides, acides aminés ou autres minéraux) qui traitent la nutrition.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>La conclusion est à réadapter au vu des résultats obtenus qui sont en relations avec l'objectif du travail, notamment la nutrition.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Les références peuvent être révisées en respectant le type de référence choisi.</i>	

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):

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:25/10/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 31/10/2022
Manuscript Title: Etude des effets antianémiques d'un complément alimentaire à base de feuilles de <i>Jatropha gossypifolia</i> chez des rats Wistar	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---41.---37.09.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes 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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>“(Please insert your comments)”</i> The title takes into account just one objective	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments) Acceptable</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) We are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in the manuscript. I let my comments. I hope those authors will take this into account to improve this article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) Some parts need more explanation.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)Some interpretations need to review</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) Acceptable, but need to improve</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) Need to improve</i>	

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):

I recommend those authors take into account all my suggestions to improve the article

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: