



Paper: “Évaluation Comparative des Effets Anthropométriques de l’Huile de Palme, de l’Huile d’Olive Extra Vierge et de l’Huile d’Olive Contaminée par de l’Huile de Croton chez le Rat Wistar”

Submitted: 20 May 2025

Accepted: 11 October 2025

Published: 31 October 2025

Corresponding Author: Kamagate Adama

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n30p232

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Emilie Jocelyne Robet

Laboratory of Nutrition and Pharmacology, Felix Houphouet Boigny University, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Mamadou Abdoulaye Konare

Université des Sciences, des Techniques et des Technologies de Bamako (USTTB)

Faculté des Sciences et Techniques (FST), Mali

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

yes

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

oui trop d'erreurs

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

oui la méthode est claire et bien expliquée

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Oui. Cependant, il y a un sérieux problème avec la discussion. Elle doit être reprise entièrement.

Le paragraphe suivant: " Comportement complexe....sensorielles et cognitives (Rolls et al., 2002)." n'est pas une discussion. Ce sont les résultats obtenus qui doivent être discuter. Ce qui n'est pas le cas. La discussion réelle du document ne commence qu'a partir du paragraphe suivant: "La faible consommation alimentaire....celle des rats témoins."

Par conséquent, elle manque d'argument et est donc faible.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

non, la conclusion est trop brève en raison de la faiblesse de la discussion. De plus, il faut y inclure les perspectives.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

non, nous sommes en 2025, il faut actualiser les références. Elles doivent dater de moins de 10 ans et pour être plus stricte de moins de 5 ans.

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]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Il faut entièrement refaire la discussion en retirant tout le paragraphe qui n'est pas une discussion et enrichir celui où commence la discussion. (Voir mes précisions notées plus haut)

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: See Comments

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

Title needs to be revised. Kindly refer to my comments inside the paper.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Abstract is written following the scientific standards but it requires some revisions. Refer to the manuscript.

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

Yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Fairly well explained.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Some errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes. Find some comments in the paper

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

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]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This work could contribute to the valorization of studied oils.

But some revisions are required for better understanding of the paper.
