



Paper: “Enquête sur la pratique de la médecine traditionnelle en Côte d’Ivoire : profil des praticiens, identification des modes de préparation et de production des médicaments traditionnels”

Submitted: 09 September 2024

Accepted: 30 December 2024

Published: 31 January 2025

Corresponding Author: Coulibaly Bakary

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n3p51

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Akpro Lathro Anselme
National Center for Agricultural research (CNRA), Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 4: Henri Banga-Mboko
University Marien Ngouabi, Congo

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: 29-09-2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 03-10-2024
Manuscript Title: Identification of traditional medicine practitioners (PMT), improved traditional medicines (ATMs) and their production methods in Cote d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 24_79_09.2024	
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
<i>title is clear and adequate to the content</i>	

2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>Abstract presents exactly it</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a few grammatical errors)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(very clear)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Very clear also</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(the conclusion and abstract accurate and support the content)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a comprehensive references)</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): congratulations on the quality of the manuscript. the following comments should be taken into account

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: Dr. AKPRO Lathro Anselme	
University/Country: National Center for Agricultural research (CNRA)/Côte d’Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 29 th /09/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 04 th /10/2024
Manuscript Title: Identification of traditional medicine practitioners (PMT), improved traditional medicines (ATMs) and their production methods in Côte d’Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number:24,...79,09,2024.....	
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 , I approve	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: YES, I approve	

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.	2.5

<i>The title is acceptable for the content of this article. However, I would have proposed something else. In fact, identification includes the special knowledge of the traditional healer. So it is much more of a count that was done by the authors, hence the score of 3 out of 5.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	02
<i>The summary is a bit incomplete. Indeed, an article summary should contain a brief introduction of one or two sentences maximum, the objectives of the work, the methods used, the salient results and a conclusion. Here, we do not perceive the methods used</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	02
<i>Effectively, the entire manuscript contains grammatical and spelling errors. There are also some expressions which are often poorly chosen and are not essential. A lot of the words used really don't have their place. Authors do not state their ideas. For example page 6.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	02
<i>Methods of this study are not explicit and clear. The authors give the impression of being in generalities. It is not a practical work paper but rather work already carried out in the field. The methodology should clearly tell us what was done in this specific case.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2.5
<i>The results are clear but are not well presented. Tables 1 and 2 on page 5 must be combined. It is also necessary to explain in the caption how the tables should be interpreted or read by the reader. Avoid long titles for tables. The numbering of the tables also needs to be reviewed. The comments on the results should also highlight the region or city factor. The maximum and minimum is found in which city and why? In the discussion, it is necessary to explain why you find identical or different results from other authors? for example, what explains why bondoukou practitioners are more focused on the treatment of malaria or diabetes or...</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	02
<i>The conclusion must be completely redone. It must respond to the problem posed at the start, no longer return to the numerical results but to what we can remember to this study.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	03
<i>The reference is appropriate for this study</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear authors, you have covered a topic which is current and which is relevant. I congratulate you for the effort made. However, to give more value to your work, it is necessary to reorganize it:

1. You must clearly state the ideas and explain it simply
2. Avoid language twist because it is a scientific work
3. The summary must be revised for completeness. The methodology is not there or it is not clearly defined
4. The theme of work is current so more rigor is needed in the methodology and the exploitation of the results.

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: Henri BANGA-MBOKO	
University/Country: University Marien NGOUABI Congo Brazzaville	
Date Manuscript Received: 29 th September	Date Review Report Submitted: 08 th October 2024
Manuscript Title: Identification des praticiens de la médecine traditionnelle (PMT), des médicaments traditionnels améliorés (MTA) et leurs modes de productions en Côte d'Ivoire	
Identification of traditional medicine practitioners (PMT), improved traditional medicines (ATMs) and their production methods in Cote d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0979/24	
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:	
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.	2
<p>Le titre n'est pas adéquat avec le sujet abordé. Voici la proposition de changement de titre</p> <p>Enquête sur la pratique de la médecine traditionnelle en côte d'ivoire : profil des praticiens, identification des modes de préparation et de production des médicaments traditionnels</p>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
Il manqué les méthodes dans le résumé	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
RAS	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Des compléments information sont nécessaires (CF manuscrit)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
Cette section doit etre remaniée (Cf manuscrit)Les analyses statistiques ne sont pas fiables.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
A completer (Cf manuscrit)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Certaines références sont à réécrire.(Cf. manuscrit)	

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	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1-change the title

2-perform key words

3-clean the introduction

4- Describe in details Material and methods section and insert a map of the surveyed cities. The statically analysis is not perfect

5-Gather all the results in two or 3 tables. See a model in the manuscript.

6-re- write some references