Manuscript: "**Assessing Nozzle Geometry, Spacing and Height Effect on Pesticide Spray Characteristics and Swath from Ground and Aerial Sprayers**"

Corresponding author:Samuel Appah

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ahmet Dalkiran
Selcuk University, Faculty Of Fine Arts, Turkiye

Reviewer 2: Benie Aloh J. M. H
Université Félix Houphouet Boigny/Institut pédagogique National de l'Enseignement Technique et Professionnel

Reviewer 3: Sosthène N'guessan

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: Ahmet DALKIRAN	
University/Country: Selcuk University, Faculty of Fine Arts, TURKIYE	
Date Manuscript Received: 14.10.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 20.10.2020
Manuscript Title: HOW TO TEACH ART IN THE HIGHER INSTITUTES OF ARTS? THE "SCHOOL-WORKSHOP" CONCEPT AT LOOK AT THE PARADIGM "PEDAGOGY / AUTONOMY OF STUDENTS"	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1036/20	
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: No	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
Yes, the content of article is clear and adequate	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
The abstract of the study covers aims and methods and results on the concept of	

school-workshop *approaching.*	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
I am not good on grammatical of French language.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
The study methods are sufficient and suitable for understanding of the articles.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4**
The body of the work is good.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
The conclusions and summary are adequately accurate and supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
Yes, the references are appropriate for content of the article.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

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: BENIE Aloh Jean Martial Hillarion	Email:
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouet Boigny/Institut pédagogique National de l'Enseignement Technique et Professionnel.	
Date Manuscript Received: 14/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 02/11/2020
Manuscript Title: COMMENT ENSEIGNER L'ART DANS LES INSTITUTS SUPÉRIEURS D'ART? LE CONCEPT « ÉCOLE-ATELIER » AU REGARD DU PARADIGME « PÉDAGOGIE/AUTONOMIE DES ÉTUDIANTS »	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1036/20	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	**1**

results.	
LE RESUME DOIT PRESENTER SUCCINCTEMENT LE PROBLEME, LES OBJECTIFS, LA METHODOLOGIE ET LES PRINCIPAUX RESULTATS.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**0**
La méthodologie devra présenter le site de l'étude, la population (pas forcement des individus donc il peut s'agir d'un type particulier d'écrit par exemple) concernée par l'étude, l'échantillon et la technique d'échantillonnage, les techniques et instruments de collecte des données et le mode de traitement des données.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**1**
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**1**
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: