

**Manuscript: “Etude De L’arrière Effet Des Légumineuses Alimentaires Sur La Productivité Des Légumes : Cas De La Tomate (Solanum Lycopersicum), Cultivée Dans La Localité De Bouaké Au Centre De La Côte d’Ivoire”**

**Submitted: 30 March 2021**

**Accepted: 08 June 2021**

**Published: 30 June 2021**

Corresponding Author: Noupé Diakaria Coulibaly

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n21p125

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Yao Koffi Alexandre, Université Félix Houphouet Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

**Reviewer 2:** Kouame Konan, Peleforo Gon Coulibaly University of Korhogo, Ivory Coast

# ***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: YAO Koffi Alexandre	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët Boigny (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/04/2021
Manuscript Title: <b>Etude de l'arrière effet des légumineuses alimentaires sur la productivité des légumes : cas de la tomate</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0437/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/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.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre est adapté au contenu du texte.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>results.</b>	
Le résumé est bien mené	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
Fautes grammaticales et d'orthographe importants. Quelques phrases relevées avec une compréhension un peu difficile. Je suggère que l'article soit relu afin de corriger toutes les imperfections.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Méthodes bien expliquées	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il y a aucune ambiguïté dans les résultats.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Tout est bien mené. Il y a une conformité entre le résumé et la conclusion et le contenu de l'article	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les références sont appropriées. Cependant, il faut un espacement entre les auteurs.	

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

# ***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: 23/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>Etude de l'arrière effet des légumineuses alimentaires sur la productivité des légumes : cas de la tomate</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0437/21	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The title is clearly and adequate to the content of the article)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The abstract is acceptable)</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(There are many grammar and vocabulary mistakes)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(The study methods are not clearly explained)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The results are acceptable but not very presented.)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The conclusion are accurate and supported)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The references are comprehensive and are not clearly written)</i>	

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Author** must take into account these observations to improve the document