

Manuscript: “**Screening phytochimique, dosage des polyphénols et détermination de l’activité antioxydante de deux plantes anti-hypertensives du Niger**”

**Submitted: 18 February 2021**

**Accepted: 21 April 2021**

**Published: 31 May 2021**

Corresponding Author: Djamilatou Zakari Seybou

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n17p335

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Kouakou John Kouadio, UFR Biosciences, Université Felix Houphouët Boigny, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

**Reviewer 2:** Esseh Komlavi, Laboratoire de Physiologie et Pharmacologie, Faculté des Sciences, Université de Lomé, Centre de Recherche et de Formation sur les Plantes Médicinales (CERFOPLAM), Université de Lomé, Togo

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

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

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

the adstract is good, it present clearly the ot

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

(Please insert your comments)

There are grammatical and spelling errors

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

the methods is clear

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

\*

(Please insert your comments)

problem of structuring at the level of 'introduc  
the results of antioxidant activity have not be

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

\*

(Please insert your comments)

the conclusion is clear and supported by the

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

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

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

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

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

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

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

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

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

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

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3

- 4
- 5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

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

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

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

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

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

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

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

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

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

make sure to take into account all suggestior

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

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

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Oui sauf une précision dans la partie méthoc

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

(Please insert your comments)

OUI

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

oui

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

\*

(Please insert your comments)

oui pas trop d'erreurs

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

\*

(Please insert your comments)

Oui

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




\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Non cette partie est à revoir dans son ensem



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

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

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

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

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

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

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

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

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3

- 4
- 5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

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

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

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

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

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

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

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

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

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

Il faut tenir compte des remarques faites dan

