



Paper: “Etude Des Plantes Médicinales Utilisées Par Les Femmes Autochtones Pygmées (Batwa) Enceintes Dans L’hinterland Du Parc National De Kahuzi-Biega (Rift albertin, RD. Congo)”

Corresponding Author: Pacifique Mukumba

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n27p107

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abdelfettah Maouni, AbdelmalekEssaadi University-Tetouan –Morocco

Reviewer 2: Honorine Ntahobavuka

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Published: 30.09.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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. ***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: Abdelfettah MAOUNI	Email:
University/Country: AbdelmalekEssaadi University-Tetouan -Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/08/2020 15:47	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/08/2020 19h
Manuscript Title: Etude Ethnobotanique Des Plantes Médicinales Utilisées Par Les Femmes Autochtones Pygmées (Batwa) Dans L’hinterland Du Parc National De Kahuzi-Biega A Est De La RDC	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0838/20	
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 published version 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>	
Desirous of withdrawing this sentence : Dans L’hinterland Du Parc National De	

Kahuzi-Biega A Est De La RDC	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> To develop result in Abstract	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
I recommend a French revision	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> To review the word expression	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
See the answers and suggestions in the attached manuscript.	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See correction in the attached manuscript.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.
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: 4 août 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 20 août 2020
Manuscript Title: Etude Ethnobotanique Des Plantes Médicinales Utilisées Par Les Femmes Autochtones Pygmées (Batwa) Dans L’hinterland Du Parc National De Kahuzi-Biega A L’Est de la RDC	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 38.08.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

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.	
<i>Il s’agit des plantes pour les femmes autochtones qui sont enceintes, cela doit ressortir dans le titre</i>	

Proposition

Etude Des Plantes Médicinales Utilisées Par Les Femmes Autochtones Pygmées (Batwa) Enceintes Dans L'hinterland Du Parc National De Kahuzi-Biega A L'Est de la RDC

(Please insert your comments)

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.

*OK mais ce n'est pas nécessaire de mettre le sous titre dans le texte
(Please insert your comments)*

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

*Texte à retravailler car beaucoup de fautes (voir les propositions de correction dans le draft)
(Please insert your comments)*

4. The study methods are explained clearly.

*Les auteurs n'ont pas précisé si les peuples autochtones des deux territoires concernés parlent la même langue.
Est-ce que les femmes enceintes faisaient parties des enquêtés?
(Please insert your comments)*

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

Ok (Please insert your comments)

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.

Ok (Please insert your comments)

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

*Certains auteurs cités ne sont pas repris dans les références.
D'autres auteurs cités dans les références ne sont pas repris dans le texte*

(Please insert your comments)

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):

Tenir compte des remarques qui sont faites dans le manuscrit

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: