

Manuscript: “**Effets de Dix (10) Variétés de Sésame (*Sesamum indicum* (L.)) en Association avec Le Niébé (*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp) dans la Lutte Contre *Striga* Gesnerioïdes (Willd.) Vatke. au Niger”**

Submitted: 23 August 2021

Accepted: 12 October 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Amadou Mounkaila Hamissou

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p15

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Konan Aubin

Reviewer 2: Koroney Abdoul

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Effets de dix (10) variétés de sésame (<i>Sesamum indicum</i> (L.) en association avec le niébé (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> (L.) Walp) dans la lutte contre <i>Striga gesnerioïdes</i> (Willd.) Vatke. au Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0924/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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 clearly and adequate to the content of the article)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(The abstract is acceptable)</i>	

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

Author must take into account these observations to improve the document.

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: August 24, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: October 4, 2021
Manuscript Title: Effets de dix (10) variétés de sésame (<i>Sesamum indicum</i> (L.)) en association avec le niébé (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> (L.) Walp) dans la lutte contre <i>Striga gesnerioïdes</i> (Willd.) Vatke. au Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0924/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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>Yes, the title fits perfectly with the work described in this article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Yes, the summary describes perfectly the objectives, the methodology and the main results obtained. However, I would like to suggest changing the keyword "Niamey" to "Niger".</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5

<i>No, I did not find any grammatical or syntax errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Yes, the methodology is very well explained. However, I suggest that the authors propose a diagram to explain the layout of the experimental plot.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Yes, the results are very clear.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Yes, the conclusion returns to the main results obtained and emphasizes the extension of this technique to producers.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Yes, the references are filled in according to the rules indicated.</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 main suggestions are:

- Change the keyword "Niamey" to "Niger"
- proposed a diagram of the experimental plot layout;