

Paper: **“Phytochimie et evaluation de la toxicite des extraits de Sida acuta”**

**Submitted: 27 February 2024**

**Accepted: 10 May 2024**

**Published: 31 May 2024**

Corresponding Author: Traore Youssouf Zanga

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n15p164

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mamadou Abdoulaye KONARE

Université des Sciences, des Techniques et des Technologies de Bamako (USTTB)

Reviewer 2: Fègbawè Badanaro

University of Lome, Togo

Reviewer 3: Patricia Randrianavony

University of Antananarivo, Madagascar

Reviewer 4: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer A:  
Recommendation: See Comments  
-----

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

Yes but refer to the paper for my suggestion.

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

The aim is not so clear.

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

Yes. The paper needs a deeply grammatical revision.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

All the methods have been described but they need to be more professional (contracted and fluently, grammatical correction).

The choice of aqueous extract is not mentioned in the study. Also, the ethical considerations didn't appear in the methods despite the use of animal.

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

Paper needs grammatical revision.

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

The conclusion requires reformulation to highlight the obtained data. No perspective is expected.

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

The references need to be standardized. Sometimes the year is mentioned after authors, sometimes after the title or journal name.

The authors have to update their references and deep the discussion.

For instance : only 20% (3/15) of references are less than 10 years old; 13% (2/15) of references are between 10-15 years old; About 67% (10/15) of references are more than 15 years.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

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

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*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]

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

Refer to the manuscript.

-----

-----  
Reviewer B:

Recommendation: See Comments

-----

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

The title is not clear but it is adequate to the content of article

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

The objet is not clear

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

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Methods are explained with minor error

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

the body of paper is clear but contain errors

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

Conclusion supported the ontent

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

Les dates de publications parfois entre parenthèses et d'autres fois non. Les citation par moment par l'initiale des prénoms et ailleurs par les noms de familles.

1. JSN Maniepi Foumane, V Soppo Lobe, JA Metogo Ntsama, FC Mbenga Mekoulou ; F Ngolsou, P Betoté Diboué, P Obono, M Nyangono Ndongo, Nnanga Nga, J Ze Minkandé, Plantes utilisées par les femmes pour faciliter l'accouchement : Enquête Ethnobotanique auprès de 125 accouchées dans une maternité de la ville de yaoundé, HEALTH SCIENCES AND DISEASE : Vol. 22 No. 5 (2021) : Health Sciences and Disease. Retrieved from <https://www.hsd-fmsb.org/index.php/hsd/article/view/2731>;

2. Orabueze CI, Adeleke Adesgun S and Coker HA. Analgesic and antioxydant activities of stem bark extract and fractions of petersianthus macrocarpus pharmacognosy Res. 2016 ; 8 (3) : 181-185.

Par moment, les noms des auteurs sont suivis de l'année de publication avant le titre publication et d'autres fois c'est l'inverse

3. Koné M, Bleyere NM, Yapo AP, Vangah MO, Ehilé EE 2009. Evaluation de la toxicité d'un extrait aqueux de sacoglottis gabonensis (Baille)Urban (Humiriaceae) chez les rongeurs, une plante utilisée dans le traitement de l'ulcère de Buruli en Côte d'Ivoire. Int. J. Biol. Chem. Sci., 3(6) : 1286-1296.

4. Hilaly JE, Israili ZH, Lyouss B, Acuta and chronic toxicological studies of Ajuva Iva in experimental animals. Journal of Ethnopharmacology, 2004 ; 91 : 43-50.

On observe également des références incomplètes

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*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]

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

-----

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

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

the title is clear adequate to the content of the article

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

objects, methods and results are clearly present in the abstract

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

the scientific name should be written in italic  
few spelling mistakes are found in the text

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

methods are clearly explained

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

the paper is clear

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

conclusion is accurate and supported by the content

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

list of references should be uniform

*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]

4

*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]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**



Accepted, minor revision needed

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

-----