

Manuscript: “**Evaluation des effets des doses de mycorhizes sur les paramètres de croissance et de la production de trois variétés de Voandzou dans la localité de Dschang, Ouest Cameroun**”

Submitted: 12 January 2021

Accepted: 19 February 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Wang-Bara Bertrand

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n17p213

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Khalissa Cheniti, Abbas Ferhat University Setif-1-, Algeria

Reviewer 2: Konate M. N’golo, Université Joseph Ki-Zerbo, Burkina Faso

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: Khalissa CHENITI	
University/Country: Abbas Ferhat University Setif-1- / ALGERIA	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/01/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/01/2021
Manuscript Title: Evaluation of mycorrhiza doses on growth parametric and production of 3 varieties of Bambara groundnuts (Vigna subterranea (L.)) on the locality of Dschang, West Cameroon	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	68.21.2021
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.	3
<i>The title is very clear but would have been in agreement with the content or especially the objective if there were no ambiguity about the determination of this latter which sometimes is: "the necessity of an improvement in the fertility of soils by the use of new strategies" and sometimes it is: "to evaluate the effect of the</i>	

<p><i>doses based on four strains of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungus (AMC) on the production of 3 varieties of Voandzou in the field ".</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, it will be more correct if we add the term "effect" after "evaluation" as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation of mycorrhiza doses effect on growth parametric and production of 3 varieties of Bambara groundnuts (Vigna subterranea (L.)) on the locality of Dschang, West Cameroon</i></p>	
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>The summary is well written and clear including the various parts required; namely methods and results except the objective which has not been specified. In addition, the key words are not very representative.</i></p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>There are a lot of grammatical mistakes such as matching adjectives with nouns and past participles. some go so far as to change the meaning of certain statements or hypotheses.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding the spelling mistakes, they are also numerous but not serious such as the plural "s" which are sometimes in addition and other times missing in addition to the feminine endings</i></p> <p><i>At the level of several paragraphs of this article we noted some confusion in the mode of expression; we have also noted repetitions in the interpretation of certain facts. There is also use of some informal expressions</i></p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>The experimental methodology is well done and explained, however, there are some remarks to retain: we would have liked to see a detailed schematic representation of the experimental trial, because its description remains less clear and sometimes evasive in particular in the explanation of the different phases of the conduct of the test, as for the following points:</i></p> <p><i>-irrigation: which has been mentioned and explained in a fractional way, i.e. at different levels of the article</i></p> <p><i>-fertilization: where the normal NPK nutrients were used while we are in front of a trial on legumes to test the effect of biofertilizers</i></p> <p><i>Even the number of parameters studied is erroneous; they talk about 4 parameters while there are 5 whose the explanation of their measurement, or at least some of them, is confused, such as for varietal precocity.</i></p> <p><i>There is also the number of plants chosen at random to carry out all these measurements; it turns out that it is very small (10 out of 48 per UE) it seems that it is not very representative.</i></p>	
<p>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>The results are very rich, clear and well-structured overall; however, the content, while complete ie touched on all aspects of</i></p>	<p>The results are very rich, clear</p>

the study, is certainly not lacking in errors:

To start, we will quote:

-The point concerning rainfall; it should have been presented or included in the Materials and Methods section as climatic characteristics of the study region

-The parameter "Germination rate" in which the analysis of variance did not reveal any significant effect, should not have been presented in the rest of the study but just mentioned with possibly an explanation of the absence of difference between the varieties studied with respect to the undergoing treatments.

-For Plant Height, the interpretation has become a bit confusing due to a wrong expression, as is the case with a few other points in the article.

- We wonder where table n°2 comes from if the ANOVA did not give significant effects between the different treatments applied

For the rest of the parameters, the critics are almost common; to know:

-Inadequate table title

- Superficial interpretation of results

-Several repetitions

-Presence of contradictions, sometimes.

-We see that the penultimate parameter (number 4) is useless

Finally, about the General Discussion we find that despite the lack of a certain coordination between the ideas, it still remains correct and complete

and well structured overall; however, the content, while comprehensive ie it touched on all aspects of the study, is certainly not lacking in errors:

To begin with we will quote:

-the point concerning rainfall; it should have been presented or included in the Materials and Methods section as climatic characteristics of the study region

-the parameter "germination rate in which the analysis of variance did not reveal any significant effect, should not have been presented in the rest of the study but just mentioned with possibly an explanation of the absence of difference between the varieties studied with respect to the

	<p>undergoing treatments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-For Plant Height, the interpretation has become a bit confusing due to a misstatement as is the case with a few other points in the article.- We wonder where this table n ° 2 comes from if the ANOVA did not give significant effects between the different treatments applied <p>For the rest of the parameters, the criticisms are almost common; to know:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Inadequate table title- Superficial interpretation of results-Lots of repetitions-Presence of contradictions, sometimes.-We see that the penultimate parameter is useless <p>Finally with regard to the</p>
--	---

		General Discussion we find that despite the lack of a certain coordination between the ideas, it still remains correct and complete
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4	
<i>The conclusion is clear and effectively supported by the content; however we find it very simplified</i>		
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3	
<i>The bibliographic references are well presented, comprehensive and appropriate to the subject and content. However, there are few remarks to note:</i> <i>-There are several references that are missing in the text but exist on the list.</i> <i>-One of the references makes the exception for its writing (Name in Capital letter)</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):

Dear authors

Your work is very interesting and deserves to be highlighted; We therefore invite you to make all the necessary corrections, it would be clearer for your readers. If you agree, we can send you the whole article with all the comments and corrections to be made and this could be the start of a collaboration between us.

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: KONATE M. N'GOLO	
University/Country: Université Joseph KI-ZERBO/Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/01/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/02/2021
Manuscript Title: Evaluation des doses de mycorhizes sur les paramètres de croissance et de la production de trois variétés de Voandzou (<i>Vigna subterranea</i> (L.)) dans la localité de Dschang, Ouest Cameroun	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 68.01.2021	
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.	4
<i>The title is correct and well informed. I think it is adequate and matches the content of the manuscript. it would be better if the authors could remove the period at the end of the title and choose to write either the common name of the plant or its botanical name.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	5

results.	
<i>The abstract of the manuscript is correct and contains information concerning methodology and results obtained. the abstract would be better if authors could state the objective of the study at the beginning of the abstract.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>There are only minimal errors that the authors can correct after proofreading of the manuscript.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The methods used in the study are detailed and well explained.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results of the study are clear and clearly documented and do not contain errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion of manuscript is accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references used in this manuscript are comprehensive and appropriate.</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):

I suggest to the authors to correct the title by using only common name or botanical name of the plant.