

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review report. 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 review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend 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: 15-04-2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 19-04-2018
Manuscript Title: Panorama of Onion Production in Tillabéri, a region in the far west of Niger.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0458/18	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i> Why is the same address of all 4 authors repeated every time?	<i>Rating Result 4</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	Rather, 4
I abbreviated the title a little, it could be made shorter even. Not all caps please.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	Yes, 5
The paper presents a good overview of the situation of onion cultivation in the said region. The language is a bit verbose. Review the keywords, add some, do not repeat words from the title.	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	Yes, 3
Some errors in Latin names, and notions (e.g. where herb is used and a condiment or spice is meant). Consult the edited Word text.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	Yes, 4
Well described methods	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	Rather, 4
Clear explanations of the processes followed but lengthy. The circular graphics are somewhat superfluous.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	Yes, 4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	Rather extensive, 4
<i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	
Large collection of references. I did not check whether they are all cited in the body of the paper, I have not checked the style of citation	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Review the paper and use notions in English correctly. Use edited Word version submitted by reviewer. Pay attention to ??? question marks.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: Supply authors with edited Word version attached herewith. If number of pages is not too limited, the style can remain, otherwise the length can be reduced by using more compact language.

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

