



Paper: “Evaluation in vitro de l’activité antiproliférative de la teinture extraite du bois de cœur de *Pterocarpus soyauxii* Taub (Fabaceae) utilisée par les populations autochtones en République du Congo”

Submitted: 21 October 2024

Accepted: 10 January 2025

Published: 31 January 2025

Corresponding Author: Aimé Bertrand Madiélé Mabika

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n3p66

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yapo Habib Kpidi
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Lathro Anselme Akpro
Centre National de Recherche Agronomique (CNRA), Côte d’Ivoire

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: KPIDI YAPO HABIB	
University/Country: Université NANGUI ABROGOUA – ABIDJAN (Côte d’Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: Manuscript received by email on Dec. 7, 2024 21:50. Uploaded on Dec 9, 2024 at 9:21	Date Review Report Submitted: 14 déc. 2024 16:19
Manuscript Title: Evaluation préliminaire de l’activité antiproliférative de la teinture extraite du cœur de bois de <i>Pterocarpus soyauxii</i> Taub (Fabaceae) utilisée par les populations autochtones en République du Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1108/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Oui	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Oui	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: 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.	3

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Le titre mérite une légère modification comme stipule dans le résumé pour être en adéquation avec le contenu de l'article. La proposition est la suivante: “Evaluation <i>in vitro</i> de l'activité antiproliférative de la teinture extraite du cœur de bois de <i>Pterocarpus soyauxii</i> Taub (Fabaceae) utilisée par les populations autochtones en République du Congo	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Résumé fort appréciable	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Quelques fautes d'orthographe et de grammaire à l'actif des auteurs de l'article mais sans grande incidence	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Des améliorations à apporter, surtout dans la présentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Du matériel végétal ; • Dépôt cellulaire. Des observations ont été proposées pour une meilleure lisibilité de l'article.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Pas de commentaire particulier sur les résultats qui sont clairs? s	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats de l'étude ne sont pas suffisamment discutés et, donc faiblement exploités. En plus, trop d'affirmations	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Références bien notées. Toutefois, quelques harmonisations de notation méritent d'être effectuées	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	--------------------------

Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Il faut s'appliquer, confronter ces résultats à ceux d'autres auteurs ayant travaillé sur la même thématique pour une bonne orientation des discussions. Ce travail n'a pas été suffisamment discuté

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: Centre National de Recherche Agronomique (CNRA)/Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 09/12/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/12/2024
Manuscript Title: Evaluation préliminaire de l'activité antiproliférative de la teinture extraite du cœur de bois de <i>Pterocarpus soyauxii</i> Taub (Fabaceae) utilisée par les populations autochtones en République du Congo.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> the method is not clearly defined, apart from the type of test used (MTT). the author must describe the principle of this MTT test in one sentence.</p>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> for the scientific rigor and quality of the work, the author needs to make a little more effort in terms of grammar and the use of connectors to ensure the coherence of the subject matter. my observations are in the manuscript.</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Tout le matériel et les Methodes sont à revoir. Les titres et les continues ne correspondent pas forcément ou des details pas indispensables sont presents dans cette partie qui doit être révisée en suivant mes observations et propositions faites sur le manuscript.</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> All the results should be a little more commented. so as not to repeat myself, consult the manuscript to see my comments and suggestions. Is there no statistical analysis in your work? if so, why not? without it, how do you compare the sensitivity of the 2 cancer cells used?</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	

there were too many useless comments. briefly present what we learnt from this work and its interest for the populations tested in this study.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Acceptable</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):

despite my favorable opinion, the manuscript must be thoroughly revised before publication. from the abstract to the conclusion. I have carefully marked on the manuscript suggestions that may guide the author in this revision exercise.