

Paper: “**Plantes à potentialité antihypertensive de la sous-préfecture de Lakota (Région de Lôh-Djiboua, Côte d’Ivoire)**”

Submitted: 11 September 2024

Accepted: 03 December 2024

Published: 31 December 2024

Corresponding Author: Kadjo Aka Fernand

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n36p46

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Cynthia Yapo

Université Alassane OUATTARA (Bouaké), Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Traore Oumarou

CNRST, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: YAPO Yomeh Cynthia Viviane	
University/Country: Université Alassane OUATTARA (Bouaké) / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 22/10/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/10/2024
Manuscript Title: Plantes à potentialité antihypertensive de la sous-préfecture de Lakota (Région de Loh-Djiboua, Côte d'Ivoire) Plants with antihypertensive potential from the sub-prefecture of Lakota (Loh-Djiboua region, Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0984/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Oui / Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/Oui You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/Oui	

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) This is a good and classic title Nevertheless antihypertensive plants have not been studied in this region of Côte d'Ivoire.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) Yes, The abstract presents objects, methods, and results which makes the article scientifically rich</i>	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) Yes, just a few small errors, but otherwise it's fine</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) Yes, the study methods are explained clearly.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments) It's clear and do not contain errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) conclude well with prospects</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments) Yes, but he needs to update a few references and the whole thing will be fine</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"/>

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: TRAORE Oumarou	
University/Country: CNRST/Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/10/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/11/2024
Manuscript Title : Plantes à potentialité antihypertensive de la sous-préfecture de Lakota (Région de Lôh-Djiboua, Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0984/24	
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>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>Bien vouloir prendre en compte les commentaire dans le manuscrit français</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) voir les amendements dans le manuscrit</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Commentaires dans le manuscrit	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Commentaires dans le document	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>Actualiser les références</i>	

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):

**Bien vouloir revoir le style de rédaction et documenter encore plus la discussion.
Aussi bien vouloir actualiser vos références.**

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: 22/10/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 30/10/2024
Manuscript Title: Plantes à potentialité antihypertensive de la sous-préfecture de Lakota (Région de Lôh-Djiboua, Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0984/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: no	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: 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
The title of the manuscript is clear and reflects the content. From the introduction to the conclusion, including the methodology and the results, I note a conformity with the title.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
The abstract includes all the parts including the objective, the methodology and the results.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
here are indeed some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article but they do not detract from its quality but they must be corrected.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

The study methods were well presented. However, there are some clarifications to be made regarding the sampling methods used and the data collection techniques.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
he results are clear and well presented. There are only a few observations to take into account when analyzing certain results.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusion is well done and summarizes the content of the work well.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references are appropriate and complete	

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):

would like to tell the authors that the observations made are aimed at improving the quality of the work presented. They should take them into account to enable the editors to publish a quality article.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: