

**Paper: “Some Medicinal Plants with Anti-breast Cancer Activity and the Input of Phytotherapy in the Treatment of Breast Cancer”**

**Submitted: 18 January 2023**

**Accepted: 16 June 2023**

**Published: 30 June 2023**

Corresponding Author: Julien A. Gaetan Segbo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n18p66

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Doina Georgescu

“Victor Babes” University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania

Reviewer 2: Gbe Kouakou N'dri Ange Konan

Félix Houphouët-Boigny University, Abidjan, Ivory Coast

Reviewer 3: Mamadou Abdoulaye Konare

Faculté des Sciences et Techniques (FST), Mali

-----  
Reviewer C:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

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

Title is clear and adequate to the content of the paper

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

The abstract clearly presents the main aspects of the article

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

The grammar of the article is satisfactory

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The article seems to be a narrative review. But as I see there is no chapter where methods were clearly stated

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

The body of the article is acceptable and does not contain errors. However, given the subject controversial of the article, I would suggest a brief chapter of Discussions.

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

Conclusions are accurate and agree with the content of the paper

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

References are generally OK. However, I would suggest that references should not be older than 10-15 years

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

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

1

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

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

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

There is a good work related to a very interesting topic. However you need to set a chapter of Methods and a chapter of Discussion.

-----

-----  
Reviewer I:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

the manuscript does not present the perspectives of breast cancer treatment. rather, it presents a bibliography of plants used in local treatment. the title should therefore be modified.

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

the summary must be repeated and adapted to the new data collected.

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

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

no methodology has been described. it would be interesting to give the sources (database or other) of collection. if a survey has been conducted, it should also be mentioned.

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

the body of the document is well written with very few errors. some parts should be expanded to make the manuscript more interesting.

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

the conclusion is too long. no author should be cited. it should also be rewritten.

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

the conclusion is too long. no author should be cited. it should also be rewritten.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

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

3

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

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

2

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

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

3

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

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

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

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

2

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

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

4

**Overall Recommendation!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

-----