

Manuscript: “**Effets du Précédent Cultural de L’arachide (Arachis Hypogaea L.) et de la Fumure Minérale sur la Production du Coton (Gossypium Hirsutum L.)**”

Submitted: 19 April 2021

Accepted: 02 September 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Yoboué Ahou Natachat

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p260

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Coulibaly Noupé Diakaria, Côte d’Ivoire

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: COULIBALY Noupe	
University/Country: CNRA / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 30 /07 /2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 08 /08 /2021
Manuscript Title: Effets des Précédents Arachides (<i>Arachis Hypogaea</i> L.) et de la Fumure Minérale sur la Production du Coton (<i>Gossypium Hirsutum</i> L.).	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 04.05.2021	
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 adequate but needs some corrections to be taken into account</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>Methods and results are OK, but the objects need some clarifications</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Grammatical errors and spelling mistakes issue is acceptable, but need to be improved</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3,5
<i>The methodology is acceptable</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results need to be more explained</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2,5
<i>The conclusion is not more accurate according to results obtained</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references are comprehensive, but the author must reduce them</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

All the corrections are made directly in the text. I want the authors to have a deep look at on the results and the discussion. Especially for the discussion I recommend to the authors to follow the three steps needed for a good performance, (i) Summarize the results, (ii) Give your own scientific interpretation and (iii) compare their results to others authors.

Finally, it is about to take into account all the corrections made in the manuscript.