



Paper: “Comparative Study of Nutritional Value of Wheat, Maize, Sorghum, Millet, and Fonio: Some Cereals Commonly Consumed in Côte d’Ivoire”

Corresponding Author: Emilie Jocelyne Robet

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n21p118

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Meïte Alassane, Université Felix Houphouët-Boigny/ Côte D’ivoire

Reviewer 2: Assem Elshazly

Published: 31.07.2020

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: 26-04-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 28-04-2020
Manuscript Title: Comparative study of nutritional value of some cereals (wheat, corn, sorghum, millet and fonio) commonly consumed in Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0526/20	
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.	3
The title is correct but must be reworded for remove the parentheses New title: Comparative study of nutritional value of wheat, corn, sorghum, millet and fonio, some cereals commonly consumed in Côte d'Ivoire	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2

<i>Object, methods and results are not well presented.</i> <i>Abstract French and abstract English are different</i> <i>There are not comparison between the contents of different cereals</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
yes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Yes but this parts must be divided as the part of result.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>No, In introduction finds some recent information of the consumption of cereals (less of ten years). Describe correctly the objective of study.</i> <i>Discussion is linear and there is no comparison with rice.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
No, it is incorrect to mentioned that the cereals contain a significant quantity of proteins, lipids. there is not the perspective	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>Several references are inappropriate and dated (over ten years)</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):

Harmonized French and English abstract and put them in accordance of the body of the paper

Defined clearly the objective and aim of the study

Subdivide the methods in different section as in the party of result

Varied the presentation of result

Finds the recent and appropriate references for la discussion

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 26 April 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 30 April
Manuscript Title: COMPARATIVE STUDY OF NUTRITIONAL VALUE OF SOME CEREALS (WHEAT, CORN, SORGHUM, MILLET AND FONIO) COMMONLY CONSUMED IN CÔTE D'IVOIRE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0526/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No NO	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
English should be checked	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Some changes and comments are provided in track changes in the main text</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>Some changes and comments are provided in track changes in the main text</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Some changes and comments are provided in track changes in the main text</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Some changes are provided in track changes in the main text</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Some changes and comments are provided in track changes in the main text
English languished need to check

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Some changes and comments are provided in track changes in the main text
English languished need to check