

Manuscript: **“Valeur Nutritive Des Especies Herbacees Appetees Par Les Ruminants Sur Les Parcours Naturels Du Nord-Est Du Benin”**

Submitted: 31 August 2020

Accepted: 15 January 2020

Published: 31 January 2020

Corresponding Author: Dr. Kadidjatoulaï O. Badarou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n3p265

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Lalla Aicha Lrhorfi,
University Ibn Tofail, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Kouame Konan,
Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo ,Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Mohamed Najih,
INRH, Maroc

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: LRHORFILalla Aicha	Email:
University/Country: Ibn Tofail Kenitra	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/10/2020
Manuscript Title: Nutritive des espèces herbacées appréciées par les ruminants sur les parcours naturels du NORD-EST du BENIN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0944/20	
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>Le titre est clair</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	3

results.	
<i>Le résumé est composé de l'objectif, de la méthodologie et des résultats mais contient des abréviations qui ne sont pas définies</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Il ya des phrases qui sont mal exprimées, partout des mots liés, pas d'espace après une virgule..., pas d'espace entre deux partie ou deux paragraphes, fautes d'orthographe.....</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Pas clairement</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>Contient des résultats intéressants mais avec beaucoup d'erreurs (voir mes remarques en jaune sur l'article). Et des tableaux qui ne sont pas aux places convenables, des paramètres qui ne sont pas bien définis.....</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Même remarques que les autres parties</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>À écrire les références de la même façon</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):

À revoir totalement l'article

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: 12/3/2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: VALEUR NUTRITIVE DES ESPECES HERBACEES APPETEES PAR LES RUMINANTS SUR LES PARCOURS NATURELS DU NORD-EST DU BENIN	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	
de préférence mettre entre parenthèse bovidés après ruminants 4	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
le résumé est clair	

4	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
Quelques erreurs d'orthographe 4	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
Nous n'avons pas d'information sur la zone d'étude Préciser la durée qui sépare le prélèvement et la mise en étuve 3	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
Des difficultés au niveau des abréviations ; à titre d'exemple en spectrométrie vous utilisez MAT qui veut dire Matière sèche et en texte vous parlez du MAT comme matière azotée totale ? Matière minérale (MM) vous n'en parlez pas dans la méthodologie 3	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
Claire 4	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
12 références au texte ne figurent pas dans la liste 07 références dans la liste ne figurent pas au texte 2	

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):