

Paper: “Étude Analgésique des Extraits Hydroéthanoliques de *Clerodendrum splendens* G. Don (Lamiaceae) et *Nephrolepis bisserata* (Sw.) Schott (Nephrolepidaceae) : Deux Plantes de la Pharmacopée Ivoirienne”

Submitted: 28 June 2023

Accepted: 27 December 2023

Published: 31 January 2024

Corresponding Author: Crystel Natacha Bohoussou

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n6p244

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dounia N.
Université de Yaoundé I, Cameroun

Reviewer 2: Katinan Etienne
Université Nangui Abrogoua, 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!

Reviewer Name: Pr DOUNIA	
University/Country: Cameroun	
Date Manuscript Received: 16 Janvier 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 18 Janvier 2024
Manuscript Title : Etude analgésique des extraits hydroéthanolique de <i>Clerodendrum splendens</i> et <i>Nephrolepis bisserata</i> : deux plantes de la pharmacopée ivoirienne	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0136/24	
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.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Le titre est bien en adéquation avec le contenu	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(lease insert your comments)</i>	
Le résumé respecte la methodologie	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Lire et relire le texte corrigé quelques petites fautes d'omission des mots ou de lettre	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Une méthodologie claire et répliable	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les calculs bien faites et bien interprétés	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Bien expliqué	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Bonne littérature avec des articles bien récents et approprié	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Lire et relire l'article. Il y a deux mots sautés à l'introduction.

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: OUATTARA Katinan Etienne	
University/Country: Université Nangui Abrogoua/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 17/01/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/01/2024
Manuscript Title: Analgesic study of hydroethanolic extracts of Clerodendrum splendens and Nephrolepis bisserata : two Ivorian pharmacopoeia plants	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0136/24	
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.	5/5

Nous avons attribué la note de 5 car le titre est clair, précis et correspond au contenu de l'article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3/5
Le résumé est clair, présente les objectifs, la méthodologie et les résultats. Mais certaines données mal rédigées rendent la compréhension difficile	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4/5
Nous avons relevé 12 fautes de grammaire et d'orthographe dans le manuscrit soit 10%. C'est insignifiant pour ce document	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5/5
Les méthodes d'étude sont clairement expliquées.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2/5
Les résultats sont mal rédigés et désorganisés rendant difficile la compréhension	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3/5
La conclusion ou le résumé sont exacts et étayés par le contenu. Mais certaines parties mal rédigées rendent la compréhension complexe	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3/5
La plupart des références sont complètes. Mais l'auteur de l'article n'a pas tenu compte du guide de la revue pour les références bibliographiques	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

L'auteur doit tenir compte des remarques pour l'amélioration de la qualité du document

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Nous remercions les rédacteurs de m'avoir associé à la correction du document et pour leur rôle capital dans le domaine de la recherche scientifique.