



**Paper: “Étude ethnobotanique et screening phytochimique des plantes médicinales utilisées dans la gestion traditionnelle des symptômes associés à la COVID-19 en Basse Guinée”**

**Submitted: 30 July 2025**

**Accepted: 23 December 2025**

**Published: 31 December 2025**

Corresponding Author: Mohamed Kerfalla Camara

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n36p128

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Sylla Youssouf  
Université Nangui ABROGOUA, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Yapo Yomeh Cynthia Viviane  
University Alassane OUATTARA (Bouaké), Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Bene Kouadio  
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 4: Blinded

### 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: SYLLA Youssouf	
University/Country: Université Nangui ABROGOUA, Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 02-08-2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 09-07-2025
Manuscript Title: <b>Étude ethnobotanique des plantes médicinales utilisées dans la gestion traditionnelle de COVID-19 et les Symptômes associés en Basse Guinée</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 05.-31.08.2025	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
I have proposed a small modification in the French version of the title which becomes : <b>Étude ethnobotanique des plantes médicinales utilisées dans la gestion traditionnelle de la COVID-19 et les Symptômes associés en Basse Guinée</b>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
No comment, but there are a few suggestions I made directly in the manuscript	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
No comment, but there are a few suggestions I made directly in the manuscript	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

<i>I noted a poor organization of the activity methodology overall. The methodology for some activities was not often addressed or was insufficiently addressed. I made suggestions directly in the manuscript to improve it.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>This study is an important undertaking conducted by these authors, with interesting results. However, just as with the methodology, I also noted a poor presentation of the results overall. Some results were not presented correctly, and others were not presented at all. However, this in no way detracts from the quality of the results obtained in this study. I have also made suggestions directly in the manuscript to improve the presentation of the results.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>I have made suggestions directly in the manuscript</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate but must be harmonized throughout</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):**

This work is important and produces interesting results. The suggestions made aim to improve the presentation of the results.

Regarding the format, authors must adhere to the authors' guide. The font used, typefaces, and line spacing vary constantly; they will need to be harmonized. The same applies to references. The layout of the methodology of the activities needs to be reviewed, as does the presentation of the results. Suggestions are made directly in the manuscript to improve the quality of the article.

#### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

### 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: YAPO Yomah Cynthia Viviane	
University/Country: University Alassane OUATTARA (Bouaké) / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/08/25	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/08/25
Manuscript Title: <b>Enquête ethnobotanique sur les variétés de haricot (<i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> L.) Commercialisées dans la région du Poro, au nord de la Côte d'Ivoire</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Doi: 10.19044/esipreprint.8.2025.p196	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Oui / Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/Oui	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. (Please insert your comments) <i>This is a good and classic title</i>	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Please insert your comments) <i>Yes, The abstract presents objects, methods, and results which makes the article scientifically rich</i>	4,5
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Please insert your comments) <i>Yes, just a few small errors, but otherwise it's fine</i>	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly. (Please insert your comments) <i>Yes, the study methods are explained clearly.</i>	4
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments) It's clear <b>and do not contain errors</b></i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) conclude well with prospects</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) Yes, but he needs to update a few references and the whole thing will be fine</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):** I noticed that all the authors come from the same university. The author should diversify with an author from another university.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:** No comment, thank you.