

Paper: “Haematic Potentials of Rhyhchospora corymbosa and Olax subscorpioidea Extracti in Phenylhydrazine-induced Anaemic Rats”

Submitted: 13 December 2022

Accepted: 20 February 2023

Published: 28 February 2023

Corresponding Author: M’béfèhê Soro

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n6p208](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n6p208)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tahiri Sylla

Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé Daloa, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: SYLLA Tahiri	
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé Daloa / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/28/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/03/2023
Manuscript Title: HAEMATIC POTENTIALS OF <i>RHYNCHOSPORA CORYMBOSA</i> AND <i>OLAX SUBSCORPIOÏDEA</i> EXTRACT IN PHENYLHYDRAZINE-INDUCED ANAEMIC RATS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 47.12.2022	
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>	<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>The title is expressive of what the paper contains.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Some details have to be added to clear the abstract. Mainly, the phytochemical screening</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Spell-chek and gramma-chek need to be done</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Adequately done but without on the phytochemical screening</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>No errors in the results. Reference all Tables and Figures in the text (Figure 1, Table 1, etc.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>No comments</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Be sure to use the APA citation style in your paper</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Add the method of the phytochemical screening and the results obtained before any interpretation.

Overall good work.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: