



Paper: “Comportement D’une Variété Précoce De Mil (*Pennisetum Glaucum* (L.) R. Br) En Réponse A Différents Types De Fumures Combinées A Une Sécheresse De Fin De Cycle Au Nord De La Côte d’Ivoire”

Corresponding Author: Ambroise Siene

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n18p300

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Olayèmi Géoffroy EDEA, University of Abomey-Calavi, Republic of Benin

Reviewer 2: SORO Dogniméton, Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé; Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Saïdou Nourou SALL, Senegal

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 30 April 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 07 Mai 2020
Manuscript Title: Comportement d'une variété précoce de mil (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> (L.) R. Br) en réponse à différents types de fumures combinées à une sécheresse de fin de cycle au Nord de la Côte d'Ivoire.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0530 / 20	
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.	4
<i>The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	3.5

results.	
<i>The abstract of the article has been well presented according to its different parts which are: objective, materials and methods, results and conclusion.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2.5
<i>There are some grammatical and spelling mistakes to correct in the article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3.5
<i>The study methods are explained clearly</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3.5
<i>The body of the paper should be improved according to the reviewer's comments.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3.5
<i>The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3.5
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The article should be published as soon as the authors take the comments into account.

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: SORO Dogniméton	Email:
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé; Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: May 22, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: May 26, 2020
Manuscript Title: Comportement d'une variété précoce de mil (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> (L.) R. Br) en réponse à différents types de fumures combinées à une sécheresse de fin de cycle au Nord de la Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>The paper deals with the effect of different fertilization forms on the growth and the yield of millet variety in end of season drought. It is the response of the millet to those factors. The title is clear and adequate with the content.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The structure of the abstract include all the points mentioned and it presents the mean results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The text language level is good</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methods are adequate for the study and take into account the plant and the factors data collect methods. Then soil and manure analysis help to have additional explanation the plant behavior in the environment.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>The content is clear and there are no major points to correct. The unique element to see is Figure 3 : Evolution du nombre de talles par poquet en fonction des traitements. This figure try to show the evolution of the number of talles that should be considered cumulative from the beginning to the end to illustrate the evolution but not just looking at periodic average. The number does not decrease.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Conclusion and summary are coherent with the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references are appropriate and recent in genera.</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):

I recommend you to modify the figure 3. If you have the phosphorus analysis results, I suggest you to integrate them in the tables. It is an important element and its interpretation would not be a conditional point.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The manuscript is well written and appropriate. The theme is really actual in the context of uncertainty in rain season in the north of Cote d'Ivoire particularly and that is a serious constraint to millet production. Indeed, soil fertility is being reduce, climate changes cause scarcity in rain falls and the millet varieties are late ones in general. The can escape end season droughts. Introducing early varieties could be a solution for the agriculture. The paper is proposing an early variety and a manure to enhance soil and species productivity. I would recommend to editors, according to its quality, the paper be published after the proposed improvement are taken into account by authors with no need to come back to me again.