



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL  
by European Scientific Institute



**Paper: “Study of the Efficacy of Moringa Oleifera Roots Applied as a Poultice in the Symptomatic Treatment of Gonarthrosis”**

**Submitted: 20 October 2025**

**Accepted: 21 March 2026**

**Published: 31 March 2026**

Corresponding Author: Vigniako Roussaint Dossou-Yovo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n9p35

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Elza Nikoleishvili  
University of Georgia, Georgia

Reviewer 2: Carlos Alberto Batista Dos Santos  
Universidade Do Estado Da Bahia, Brazil

Reviewer 3: 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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
<b>Manuscript Title:</b> Study of the efficacy of <i>Moringa Oleifera</i> roots applied as a poultice in the symptomatic treatment of gonarthrosis.	
<b>•Short running title:</b> Efficacy of <i>Moringa Oleifera</i> roots applied as a poultice.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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: 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.

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b> <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Study of the efficacy- <i>Efficacy</i> is the accepted scientific term used in medicine, pharmacology, clinical trials, and public health.	<b>4</b>
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b> <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> yes	<b>4</b>
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b> <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Done in bellow</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The manuscript describes the study as “ <b>randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, open-label</b> ”, which is contradictory.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A trial <b>cannot</b> be double-blind and open-label at the same time.</li> <li>• Clarify <b>who was blinded</b> (participants? assessors? investigators?) and <b>which groups were blinded</b>.</li> </ul>	
The <b>third arm (drug treatment)</b> is explicitly open-label, but it is unclear whether outcome assessors remained blinded.	
The method of randomization (e.g., computer-generated sequence, block randomization) is <b>not described</b> .	
The Moringa and placebo groups both received <b>paracetamol 1 g twice daily</b> , whereas the drug-treatment group received <b>NSAIDs + opioids + corticosteroid injections</b> .	
This makes mechanistic comparisons difficult and introduces <b>treatment-intensity bias</b> .	
No sample size justification or power calculation is provided.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Statistical Reporting Needs Improvement</b>	
p-values such as <b>p = 0.00000</b> are not acceptable. Should be reported as <b>p &lt; 0.0001</b> .	
<b>Missing Adverse Event Data Structure</b>	
Adverse effects are only briefly mentioned.	
No quantitative reporting (number, severity, type per group).	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
When be modified the results, conclusion also be changed.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<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 type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Dear Authors address an important topic—evaluating a plant-based therapeutic approach for knee osteoarthritis pain. The manuscript is grounded in a relevant clinical context, and the idea of exploring a low-cost, locally available alternative treatment is particularly valuable for resource-limited settings. The study also demonstrates good patient retention and includes both a placebo and standard therapy comparison group. However, several major methodological and reporting issues need to be addressed before the manuscript can be considered for publication. Recommendations: Provide a clear description of the blinding strategy; Specify randomization method and

Allocation concealment (sealed envelopes, central randomization, etc.) Who generated the sequence and who enrolled participants; Explain why paracetamol supplementation was necessary and justify the comparability of treatment arms; Sample size justification or power calculation need to be provided; Improve transparency and standardize reporting; Justify early stopping Placebo Group with a scientific or ethical rationale.

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

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

**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.**

There are some spelling mistakes such as:

1. ...Study of the efficacy of Moringa Oleifera that should be ".....Study of the efficacy of Moring Oleifera.."
2. Name of authors should be "Names of authors"
3. Abstract and key words should be "Abstracts and keywords"
4. ...thus, this work brings the results of .... should be "..thus, this work presents the results of..."
5. ...Inclusion, exclusion and non-inclusion criteria... should be "Inclusion, exclusion, and non-inclusion criteria" with punctuation

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes

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

Yes it is clear

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

he conclusion presented in the article is overall accurate and consistent with the data and discussion provided. It effectively summarizes the therapeutic potential of Moringa oleifera roots in the symptomatic treatment of gonarthrosis and aligns with the study's objectives and findings. However, there are minor issues related to punctuation, grammar, and sentence structure throughout the text that slightly affect readability. Despite these language imperfections, the scientific content and conclusions remain coherent, logical, and well supported by the result

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
5

***Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
5

***Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]  
4

***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):**

The manuscript presents a well-structured and relevant clinical study assessing the efficacy of *Moringa oleifera* roots in the symptomatic treatment of gonarthrosis. The objectives are clear, and the results are consistent with the conclusions drawn. Overall, the study is scientifically sound and contributes valuable data to the field of traditional and complementary medicine.

However, the manuscript would benefit from a careful language revision. Minor errors in punctuation, grammar, and sentence structure are present throughout the text and slightly affect fluency and clarity. The authors are encouraged to perform a detailed proofreading or seek language editing support to enhance readability and ensure consistency in terminology.

Despite these minor language issues, the content remains coherent, and the findings are well supported by the methodology and results presented.

-----

-----