

Manuscript: “**Pratiques Endogènes De La Culture Des Mangues Locales (Mangifera Indica L, Anacardiaceae) Dans Les Départements Du Noun Et De La Lékié Au Cameroun**”

Submitted: 29 June 2021

Accepted: 03 August 2021

Published: 31 August 2021

Corresponding Author: Christelle Flavie Mbieji Kemayou

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n29p128

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Ousmane Ndiaye
Sénégal

Reviewer 3: Yapi Arnaud Freddy
Universty of Peleforo Gon Coulibaly, Korhogo, Côte d'Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Ousmane Ndiaye	Email: ousmane.ndiaye@univ-zig.sn
University/Country: Sénégal	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 18/07/2021
Manuscript Title: Pratiques endogènes sur la culture des mangues locales (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) dans les Départements du Noun et de la Lékié (Cameroun)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0739/21	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is clear and adequate!	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Some results must be presented before the analysis!	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Some grammatical errors are corrected.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The result mostly presented are percentage then no error barres in the figures!! The	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<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):

The figures must be without the barre errors
The amplitude of classes must be same!

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: YAPI Arnaud Freddy	Email:
University/Country: Universty of Peleforo Gon Coulibaly, KORHOGO/ CÔTE D'IVOIRE	
Date Manuscript Received: 09/07/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/07/2021
<i>Manuscript Title:</i> Pratiques endogènes sur la culture des mangues locales (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) dans les Départements du Noun et de la Lékié (Cameroun)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0739/21	
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
No comment	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
No comment about the contain of the abstract. But there is some imperfection in the writing	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
There are a lot of grammatical mistakes. It would be better that the author did a good re-reading or gave it a specialist in the language to read it.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
Put only the important results. Too many snacks.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
No comment	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Some references do not match. Choose recent references at least from 2000.	

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):

- Restructure the results. Some are irrelevant!
- Discussions are badly done! Explain your results! No those of other authors.
- When you cite an author and allies for the first time (APA) please, give all theirs names.