

Paper: “Rendement et Composition Chimique du Tourteau de Tetracarpidium conophorum (Müll. Arg.) Hutch. & Dalz Produit par Pression Mécanique et Hydrodistillation”

Submitted: 28 August 2023

Accepted: 28 December 2023

Published: 31 December 2023

Corresponding Author: Henri Banga Mboko

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n36p175

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Bintou Sessouma

Université Joseph KI-ZERBO, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: Ouattara Amidou

Université de San Pedro, Côte d’Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: 22-11-2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 26-11-2023
Yield and chemical composition of oil cake of <i>Tetracarpidium conophorum</i> (Müll. Arg.) Hutch. & Dalz produced by pressure in cold and hydrodistillation.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0919/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: 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	

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.	4
<i>(Clear)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>the summary clearly outlines the problem being addressed.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Not too many grammatical errors in the text</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(the methodology is clearly explained)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>the results are quite clear, but some errors and formatting are necessary</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>exactly)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(the references are relevant, but for the most part outdated</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):

the author is strongly encouraged to incorporate inputs to improve the manuscript

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Pr Bintou SESSOUMA	
University/Country: Université Joseph KI-ZERBO, Ouagadougou, BURKINA FASO	
Date Manuscript Received: 13 October 2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Rendement et composition chimique du tourteau de <i>Tetracarpidium conophorum</i> (Müll. Arg.) Hutch. & Dalz produit par pression mécanique et hydrodistillation	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0919/23	
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.	3

If the yields obtained from the two techniques used to obtain the cakes are calculated and given in the article, the chemical composition of the cake on the other hand has not been sufficiently documented.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The objects, methods and results are well presented in the abstract	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
There are many grammatical and spelling errors in this article and especially sentences whose meaning we do not understand.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
The two study methods used by the authors are not clearly described in the article, particularly with regard to the determination of certain parameters such as temperature.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The processes leading to the results are not based on clearly explained scientific facts.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
Conclusions drawn from the results are mostly not based on scientifically established evidence	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
The references are basic, but updated for some.	

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):

This article must be revised in form and especially in substance. There are many sentences that are poorly said or whose idea is poorly expressed or is not at all understandable. The figures and tables are not sufficiently explicit or poorly commented. Conclusions must be drawn from a scientifically established approach. It is also necessary to correct grammatical and spelling errors and carefully adopt a presentation plan for the article in connection with the note to the authors.