

Paper: “Effet des Substrats à Base de Déchets Sylvicoles et Agricoles Sur la Croissance des Semis de Terminalia ivorensis A. Chev en Pépinière Forestière en Côte d’Ivoire”

Submitted: 18 October 2022

Accepted: 22 March 2023

Published: 31 March 2023

Corresponding Author: Raymond Kouame

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n9p189](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n9p189)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Monssou Eugène Oulaïtar
Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Mohamed Mahamoud Charahabil
University Assane Seck of Ziguinchor, Senegal

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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. Monssou	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/02/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 02/03/2023
Manuscript Title: Effet des substrats à base de déchets sylvicoles et agricoles sur la croissance et le développement des semis de <i>Terminalia invorensis</i> en pépinière forestière à Daloa (centre ouest de la Côte D'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No 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 clear)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Yes the abstract presents objects, methods and results clearly)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Yes there are some errors)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Yes the study methods are explained clearly)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(The results are clear but there are some errors)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(yes)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(there are comprehensive and appropriate)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I accept your article, but you must correct these errors

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No comment

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: CHARAHABIL	
University/Country: Senegal	
Date Manuscript Received: le 20/02/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: le 23/02/2023
Manuscript Title: Effect of substrates based on forestry and agricultural waste on the growth and development of Terminalia invorensis seedlings in a forest nursery in Daloa (central west of the Ivory Coast)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1114/22	
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.	1

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Il y a beaucoup de faute de français (orthographe et grammaire). Il y a aussi des phrases trop longue et incoherentes. Des points et des virgules qui traînent partout	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Il y a trop de détails inutile dans la cette partie. Les outils de terrains ne sont pas nécessaire à citer. On ne connait pas la nature du bois de scierie qui est fondamental pour les interaction physicochimiques	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Tres basiques	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>Revoir les recommandation de la revue</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Ce manuscrit doit être relu par un chercheur senior avant resoumission. Le style rédactionnel est trop basique, beaucoup de faute et beaucoup de détails inutiles.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: