



Paper: “**Confirmation De Ségrégation, Au Moyen Du BC1, De L’un Des Deux Loci Codant Pour La Couleur Du Germe Chez Le Cocotier Nain à Abidjan (Côte d’Ivoire)**”

Corresponding Author: Sidibe Daouda

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n24p88

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Bouharati Saddek, Algeria

Reviewer 3: Jean de Dieu Mangambu, Université Officielle de Bukavu/RDCongo

Published: 31.08.2020

## ***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: Bouharati Saddek	Email:
University/Country: Algeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 2020-04-24	Date Review Report Submitted: 2020-06-06
Manuscript Title: Confirmation de la ségrégation, au moyen du BC1, de l'un des 2 loci codant pour la couleur du germe chez le cocotier	
<b>Manuscript Number:</b> 0473/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper <input type="checkbox"/> 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>A bit long without containing the analysis technique used</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Clear and precise</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Good linguistic quality</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Well structured</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Writing respecting standards</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>A precision to add to the conclusion</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>References to be expanded with recent resources</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

- Il est nécessaire de rajouter un bref aperçu sur la technique d'analyse utilisée et les résultats obtenus en fin de l'introduction.
- Mettre l'accent sur l'aspect économique des résultats obtenus en fin de la conclusion.
- De préférence, enrichir la bibliographie par des travaux récents.

**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!***

Reviewer Name: Mangambu Mokosos	Email:
University/Country: Université Officielle de Bukavu/RDCongo	
Date Manuscript Received: 5/06/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 5/06/2020
Manuscript Title: Confirmation de la ségrégation, au moyen du BC1, de l'un des 2 loci codant pour la couleur du germe chez le cocotier/ modifié : Confirmation de la ségrégation, au moyen du BC1,	

de l'un des 2 loci codant pour la couleur du germe chez le cocotier nains d'Abidjan (Côte d'Ivoire)
ESJ Manuscript Number: 54.05.2020
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3,5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Sera modifié et complété comme suit : Confirmation de la ségrégation, au moyen du BC1, de l'un des 2 loci codant pour la couleur du germe chez le cocotier nains d'Abidjan (Côte d'Ivoire) ?</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4/5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4/5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3,5/5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3,5/5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4,5/5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5/</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>XXXXX</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

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