



Paper: "Activité hypoglycémiante des feuilles de Tridax procumbens chez des rats rendus diabétiques par l'alloxane lors une étude comparative sur 30 jours"

Submitted: 20 June 2025 Accepted: 08 August 2025 Published: 31 August 2025

Corresponding Author: Adama Kamagate

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n24p57

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ibrahim Bah Hopital du Mali, Mali

Reviewer 2: Alfa Teou

Centre de Recherche et de Formation sur les Plantes Médicinales (CERFOPLAM), Université de Lomé, Laboratoire de Microbiologie et de Contrôle de Qualité des Denrées Alimentaires (LAMICODA), Université de Lomé, Ecole Supérieure des Techniques Biologiques et Alimentaires (ESTBA), Université de Lomé, Lomé, Togo

Reviewer 3: Coulibaly Seydou Ouolouho Université PELEFORO GON COULIBALY, Côte d'Ivoire Reviewer A: Recommendation: Revisions Required The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. Yes the title is clear and adequate to the contente The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results. Yes There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. There are a few grammatical errors. Could see my comments on the paper The study METHODS are explained clearly. The method is clear The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. The body is countaining errors. Could see my comments on the paper The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content. Yes the concusion is accurate The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate. The citations are well listed 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] 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]

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please to check the discussion and discuss more your results.

The second graphic is also missing

.....

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

WE BELIEVE THAT THE TITLE IS ACCEPTABLE, BUT IF WE USE THE PICOT, WE WILL SEE MISSING INFORMATION IN THE TITLE.

THEREFORE, WE PROPOSE THE FOLLOWING TITLE:

Hypoglycemic activity of Tridax procumbens leaves in alloxan-induced diabetic rats, a 30-day comparative study

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The summary is acceptable, however the introduction of alloxan as stated in the document does not appear in the summary.

according results: It is also important to present the confidence interval in order to better understand the significance of the p-value (P), insofar as the ANOVA indicates that there is a difference only between at least one of the groups, and given that the confidence interval containing the value (0) has no epidemiological significance.

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

There are a few typos in the manuscript, including:

- On page 3, "oeuvre" is not spelled correctly.
- "Pharmacopée" is attached to "de."
- The reference "NIYAH et al" is not spelled correctly.
- On page 4, "pharmacopée" is attached to "de."
- The word "normo gycemique" is not a single word, but a compound word.
- 200mg/dl and not 200mg/dL

etc.....

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

This study was well conducted, however it would be better to show the confidence interval in the results,

especially for the Turkey-Kramer test, which allows for a better assessment of the difference between groups.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. Please refer to pages 3 and 4 for some errors. The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content. The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate. Please rate the TITLE of this paper. [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] 4 Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper. [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] 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] **Overall Recommendation!!!** Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: Coulibaly Seydou Ouolouho			
University/Country: Université PELEFORO GON COULIBALY - Côte d'Ivoire			
Date Manuscript Received: 28-07-2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 01-08-2025		
Manuscript Title: Étude de l'Activité Hypoglycémiante des Extraits de la Poudre des			
Feuilles de Tridax procumbens chez les Rats Rendus Diabétiques			
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	he "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.

	Rating Result
Questions	[Poor] 1-5
	[Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
(Please insert your comments) the title matches the content	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
(Please insert your comments) we find the objects, methods and results to	here
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this	4
article.	7
(Please insert your comments) A single grammatical error.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
(Please insert your comments) the methods are explicit.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
(Please insert your comments) the results are quite clear.	•

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3	
(Please insert your comments) the conclusion is in agreement with the content		
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4	
(Please insert your comments) the references are 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):

For plant material, it is important to specify the part of the plant to use: leaves, stem, roots or the whole plant.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: