



Paper: “Évaluation de l’effet cicatrisant de la gomme de Saba senegalensis chez Rattus norvegicus”

Submitted: 20 November 2024

Accepted: 30 January 2025

Published: 28 February 2025

Corresponding Author: Kouame Yao Yves

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n6p76

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Coulibaly Bakary
Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé-Daloa, Cote d’Ivoire

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!*

Date Manuscript Received: 07012025	Date Review Report Submitted: 08012025
Manuscript Title: Évaluation de l'effet cicatrisant de la gomme de <i>Saba senegalensis</i> chez <i>Rattus norvegicus</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 25 11 12 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>(YES, the title is clear and adequate to the content of the article)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3

<i>(the abstract presents objectif, results, but no methods)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(NO, not a grammatical errors or spelling mistakes)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>the methodology is too long and doesn't make it easy to understand, ut the study material is not sufficiently informative)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(the results are clear and not content errors)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(the conclusion is too brief, as is the introduction)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(YES)</i>	

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	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

the author should take into account suggestions made in the manuscript to improve the scientific quality of the article

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 COULIBALY Bakary	
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé-Daloa, Cote d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 7Janvier 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 13 Janvier 2025
Manuscript Title: Évaluation de l'effet cicatrisant de la gomme de <i>Saba senegalensis</i> chez <i>Rattus norvegicus</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 1211/24	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
Review the summary. The methodology used for the search for secondary metabolites is not announced in the abstract. In addition, the results of the search for secondary metabolites and then those of healing must be given.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Congratulations on the work. I suggest that you highlight what guided the choice of the *S. senegalensis* plant and review your summary to perfect your work.