

Manuscript: “**Agronomic Performance Of S1 Maize Lines Derived From A Bi-Parental Cross Under Infested And Striga Free Environments**”

Submitted: 04 June 2021

Accepted: 22 June 2021

Published: 31 July 2021

Corresponding Author: Abdoul-Madjidou Yacoubou

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n25p306

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Priscilla Ribeiro, Ghana

Reviewer 2: Hamadou Sidibe, University Joseph KI-ZERBO, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, Institute of Environment and Agricultural Research (INERA), Ouaga, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: Hamadou Sidibe	
University/Country: INERA_Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 5-06-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 14-06)2021
Manuscript Title: Agronomic performance of S₁ lines derived from a bi-parental cross with and without Striga infestation	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0649/21	
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>Striga kind must be specified</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Methods and results need to be clarified</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
they did not say how to lift the dormancy of the Striga seeds	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

- (1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

- (2) Changes which must be made before publication