

**Manuscript: “Caractéristiques Nutritionnelles D’un Pâturage de Jachère Dans la Savane de Korhogo, au Nord de la Côte d’Ivoire”**

**Submitted: 17 May 2021**

**Accepted: 08 October 2021**

**Published: 31 October 2021**

Corresponding Author: Kouadja Gouagoua Séverin

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p310

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Traore Beh, Université NANGUI ABROGOUA – Côte d’Ivoire

**Reviewer 2:** Konan Aubin

**Reviewer 3:** Eric Gnahore, Université Nangui Abrogoua / Côte d’Ivoire

# **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: TRAORE Beh	
University/Country: Université NANGUI ABROGOUA – Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 20 mai 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 28 mai 2021
<b>Manuscript Title: Caractéristiques nutritionnelles d'un pâturage de jachère dans la savane de Korhogo au nord de la Côte d'Ivoire</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---94.05.2021---second submission---[20]	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/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] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>  <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>results.</b>	
<i>le résumé en anglaise doit être revu par un natif anglophone. Les mots clé sont à revoir</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Il y a très peu de fautes de grammaire</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>La méthodologie doit être encore plus explicitée</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Les résultats ne contiennent pas d'erreurs mais un réaménagement est nécessaire</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>La structure de la conclusion n'est pas très respectée ;</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Il y a quelques références qui manquent dans le texte</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):

L'article ne respecte pas la note aux auteurs de la revue. Il faut utiliser le Template de la revue.

La discussion nécessite quelques réaménagements tout comme les résultats.  
Les commentaires suggestions sont directement inclus dans le texte.

# **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!***

Date Manuscript Received: 15/09/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
<b>Manuscript Title: Caractéristiques nutritionnelles d'un pâturage de jachère dans la savane de Korhogo, au nord de la Côte d'Ivoire</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0594/21	
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] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b> <i>(The title is clearly and adequate to the content of the article)</i>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b> <i>(The abstract is acceptable)</i>	<b>3</b>

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

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

Author must take into account these observations to improve the document

# **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: Dr GNAHORE	
University/Country: Université Nangui Abrogoua / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 15 / 09 / 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 22 / 09 / 2021
<b>Manuscript Title: Caractéristiques nutritionnelles d'un pâturage de jachère dans la savane de Korhogo au nord de la Côte d'Ivoire</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0954 / 21	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>  <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	4
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	4

<b>results.</b>	
<b>Prendre en compte les corrections apportées</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Manqué de rigueur dans la rédaction</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
(Please insert your comments)	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
(Please insert your comments)	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
(Please insert your comments)	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
Manque de rigueur. Les accents sont trop absents sur les lettres	

### **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):**

Réviser soigneusement l'article