

Manuscript: “**Effets des Demi-Lunes Multifonctionnelles sur la Production du Sorgho en Afrique de l’Ouest: Cas de la Région de Tahoua au Niger**”

Submitted: 31 May 2021

Accepted: 16 June 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Maman Nassirou Ado

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p112

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Moloba Lukombo Yannick, Ingénieur Agroéconomiste et Assistant de Recherche, MULTINA-DMK, bureau d’études de l’Université de Kinshasa, Faculté des Sciences Agronomiques, Université de Kinshasa, RDC

Reviewer 2: Paul A. F. Houssou, Programme Technologies Agricole et Alimentaire (PTAA) du Centre de Recherches Agricoles d’Agonkanmey (CRA-A) de l’Institut National des Recherches Agricoles du Bénin (INRAB), Porto-Novo, Bénin

Reviewer 3: Koffi Ahébé Marie Hélène, Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé, UFR Agroforesterie, Laboratoire d’Amélioration de la Production Agricole, Côte d’Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, but I suggested him to change impact by effet. He must be specify by writting Sorgho production instead of agricultural production that is not clear.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes. The author should methods that are not written.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

No. Paper is well written

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, but the author should add recommendations according his results, not suggesting futur research only.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, but the author should review his bibliography as there are references that are missed on it.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

He should read ESJ guideline for updating his paper. He should revise his sentences that are sometimes long without punctuation.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

yes

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

very few

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

yes Yes , but there is a need to complete it by the physico-chemical analysis

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

is clear

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

is accurate

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Title should be corrected

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

The manuscript contains many spelling and grammatical errors that the author must correct

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The methodology has to be repeated, several parts are missing

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of the document contains missing fields that the author should insert

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The reference must be completely repeated according to authors guidelines. some authors in the text are not in the reference and vice versa

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Author must take into account all suggestions