

Manuscript: “**Acute and Subacute Toxic Aqueous Extract of the Leaves of Petroselinum Crispum Mill. in Male and Female Wistar Rats**”

Submitted: 10 September 2021

Accepted: 04 October 2021

Published: 30 November 2021

Corresponding Author: Jean Jacques Kablan

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n40p178

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Macfiberesima Gborieneomie ,University of Port Harcourt Teaching Hospital, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Moussa Gbogbo, Jean Lorougnon GUEDE University /Ivory Coast

Reviewer 3: Cinaría Albadri, Trinity College Dublin

Reviewer 4: Prof. Dr. Amal Talib Al Sa'ady, College of Pharmacy/University of Babylon, Iraq

Reviewer 5: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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:	
University/Country: University of Port Harcourt Teaching Hospital, Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 20-09-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 22-09-2021
Manuscript Title: Acute and subacute toxicity of the aqueous extract of the leaves of <i>Petroselinum crispum</i> Mill in male and female wistar rats.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ESJ 21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

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>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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): The topic should be written in this way:

Acute and subacute toxic aqueous extract of the leaves of *Petroselinum crispum* Mill in male and female wistar rats.

OECD should be written fully first in the Abstract and at the beginning of introduction before abbreviated.

Conflict of no interest should come before results.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Moussa GBOGBO	
University/Country: Jean Lorougnon GUEDE University /Ivory Coast	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/09/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/09/2021
Manuscript Title: Acute and subacute toxicity of the aqueous extract of the leaves of <i>Petroselinum crispum</i> Mill. in male and female wistar rats.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0973/21	
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.	4.0
<i>(The title of the manuscript is consistent with the content)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2.5

<i>(Methods not clearly defined)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2.5
<i>(The manuscript contains several transcription errors. Some parts of the results include forms in French)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4.0
<i>(the methods are clearly described)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3.5
<i>(The results are clear but need to be corrected)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4.0
<i>(The conclusions and abstract are consistent with the content of the manuscript)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4.5
<i>(The references were well written)</i>	

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):

The authors must correct the numerous forms in French, especially in the results. They should harmonise all decimal numbers and check some statistical treatments

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This manuscript will be of good quality after correction of the observations mentioned

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Cinaria Albadri	
University/Country: Trinity College Dublin	
Date Manuscript Received: 14/09/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 03/10/2021
Manuscript Title: Acute and subacute toxicity of the aqueous extract of the leaves of <i>Petroselinum crispum</i> Mill. in male and female wistar rats.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 73.09.2021	
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.

<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.	5
<i>Title is clear and is relevant to the purpose of the study</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>The abstract summarizes most of the study, and clearly presents the objects, methods and key findings with an appropriate length (184 words). The abstract lacks the structure of the subheadings (Purpose, Methods, Results and Conclusion) according to the journal guidelines.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The manuscript contains slight spelling and grammar mistakes throughout the text, that requires a review by the author.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Description of methods is well described according to the research's nature, purpose and design.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results were explained in chronological order and the data presented in tables. Results section clear of any grammatical or spelling errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Conclusion is accurately presented and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>References are appropriate , however the author needs to include up-to-date references.</i>	

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):

- Minor corrections are required, as suggested above.
- Include limitations for this study, if any.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

- Can be accepted for publishing after completion of corrections by author as this article is clearly to be a student's own work.
- The review of the literature is thorough so the reader will be given an adequate background about the topic.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Acute and subacute toxicity of the aqueous extract of the leaves of <i>Petroselinum crispum</i> Mill. in male and female wistar rats	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0973/21	
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>Please insert your comments</i>) 4	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
(<i>Please insert your comments</i>) 4	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4	

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):

Good methodology and Results,