



Paper: “Perte Post-Récolte Dans La Perspective De Stockage Des Bulbes D’oignons (Allium Cepa L.) En Milieu Paysan Dans Le Département De La Bénoué NordCameroun”

Corresponding Author: Housseini Djida Jacques

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n18p124

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Seth Wolali Nyamador

Reviewer 3: Rabiou Itina, Université Abdou Moumouni

Reviewer 4: Adoulkadri Laouali, UBBTi, Niger

Published: 30.06.2020

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: Seth NYAMADOR	Email:
University/Country: Togo	
Date Manuscript Received: 08 th may 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 12 th may 2020
Manuscript Title: Perte post-récolte dans la perspective de stockage des bulbes d'oignons (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.) en milieu paysan dans le département de la Bénoué Nord-Cameroun.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 02117/20	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The title is clear and fits well with the content of the manuscript	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, the abstract of the manuscript clearly presents the objectives of the study as well as the methodology used and the main results obtained.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
There are a few typos to correct in the manuscript. Our remarks are made in the text according to the "Modification tracking" mode	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The methodology adopted is clear and reproducible. However, the authors must specify how they evaluated the losses using appropriate formulas.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The content of the text is clear, but there are small typos to be corrected by the authors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The conclusion is concise and highlights the salient point of the results obtained.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>The references are appropriate and understandable. However, there are some typos to be corrected in the list of references cited (See proposal directly in the text). There are also some references cited in the text but not found in the list of bibliographical references. For example: Serad (2009), Fondji et al (2001) and Ko et al (2002).</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):

It is essential that the authors of this manuscript take into account our observations to correct the text in order to improve the quality of this manuscript.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only

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: Laouali	Email:
University/Country:UBBTi/Niger	
Date Manuscript Received:07/05/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/05/2020
Manuscript Title: Perte post-récolte dans la perspective de stockage des bulbes d'oignons (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.) en milieu paysan dans le département de la Bénoué Nord-Cameroun.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 117-02-2020	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)Le titre peut être reformuler pour mieux l'adapter au texte.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments) Il doit être retravaillé</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) Le texte est à relire ! Les ponctuations ne sont pas respectées, des mots manques dans certaines phrases, etc.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments) pas assez! L'auteur ne dit pas : - comment les mesures ont été faites! - Quelle est le type de magasin (paillote ?, en matériaux définitifs ?, etc.). - les conditions de stockages pas clairement présentées - lorsque vous contrôlez les 55 bulbes marqués, ne vous est-il pas arrivé de trouver dans le magasin d'autres pourris ou qui ont germé en dehors de ces 55? Aussi, la taille de l'échantillon est très faible pour une telle étude. En un mot, le dispositif n'est pas solide.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) Style de rédaction à améliorer</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) Ces passages sont à revoir!</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) Elle est incomplète</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Un effort de relecture et de rédaction est souhaité !

L'introduction souffre de manque de clarté ! Les idées sont décousues et la problématique pas suffisamment mise en exergue !

Pour la partie résultats et discussion, je la trouve très sobre surtout conforme aux normes par endroit!

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: