

**Paper: “Effets de *Faidherbia albida* (Delile) sur des Paramètres de Croissance et de Rendement du Mil (*Pennisetum glaucum* (L.) R. Br) en Milieu Paysan dans la Commune de Tibiri (Niger)”**

**Submitted: 22 November 2023**

**Accepted: 29 January 2024**

**Published: 29 February 2024**

Corresponding Author: Younoussou Rabo

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n6p86

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gbodja Houéhanou François Gbesso  
Université Nationale d’Agriculture (UNA)/Benin

Reviewer 2: Kaka Kiari Boukar K.  
Université de Diffa/Niger

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Gbodja Houéhanou François GBESSO	
University/Country: Université Nationale d'Agriculture (UNA)/Benin	
Date Manuscript Received:	January 11, 2024
Manuscript Title: Effets de Faidherbia albida (Delile) sur des paramètres de croissance et de rendement du mil (Pennisetum glaucum (L.) R. Br) en milieu paysan dans la commune de Tibiri (Niger)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 17	
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>	<b>4</b>

<i>(The subject is well formulated and has been well developed only, but it is not necessary to talk about certain parameters but rather about the parameters.)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(It is necessary to build on previous studies and use appropriate references. It seems that the author is the first to address this issue. His approach remains solitary)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Some formatting is necessary to comply with the journal's guidelines)</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):**

I invite the author to improve the quality of the manuscript, especially with regard to the methodological approach, which could be based on authors' references)

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

The subject is of interest to improving the yield and growth of agricultural crops. It is well developed. The author should take into account the few observations in order to improve the quality of the work.