



**Paper: “Le cactus *Opuntia tuna* (L.) Mill. et ses formes d’usage dans la zone des Niayes au Sénégal”**

Corresponding Author: Mame Sokhna Sarr

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n16p199

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Najih Mohamed  
NFRI, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Kouame Konan  
Peleforo Gon Coulibaly University of Korhogo, Ivory Coast

Published: 30.06.2020

# ***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: Mohamed NAJIH	
University/Country: NFRI/Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: April 27, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: May 3, 2020
<b>Manuscript Title : Le cactus et ses formes d'usage dans la zone des Niayes au Sénégal</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.**

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [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>(Please insert your comments)</i> It would be better the scientific name (Latin name) appears in the title. There are several species of cactus. If a problem of identification of species, it is necessary to put genus or to underline it in the summary	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The objective is badly formulated	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Well written except a few grammatical errors	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The method must be clear with a scientific approach and a proposal for a statistical test. “A representative sample of 66 people”. However, the authors do not explain this representativeness. They did not inform us about the sampling strategy	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> More works on figures. some conclusions should only be pronounced by a statistical test We have 3.2.1 but not 3.2 2	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> We should expect a recommendation to identify cactus species in the area	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> (Banque mondiale, 2010) and (CSE, 2018) not listed in the bibliography	

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

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

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

More work on methodology

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