

Manuscript: “**Effet des Doses de Semis et de la Méthode De Conduite de La Pépinière sur les Caractéristiques Morphologiques des Plantules de Cinq Variétés D’oignon (Allium cepa L.) en Côte d’Ivoire**”

Submitted: 05 May 2021

Accepted: 15 September 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Koffi Eric-Blanchard Zadjéhi

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p208

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Odon Clement N'cho, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Dr. Ir. Mamam S. Toleba, Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

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

Reviewer 4: Moloba Lukombo Yannick, DR Congo

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: 14/06/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/06/2021
Manuscript Title: Effet des doses de semis et la méthode de conduite de la pépinière sur les caractéristiques morphologiques des plantules de cinq variétés d'oignon (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.) en Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 73.05.2021	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Yes the abstract takes into account the objects, methods and results.</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>The grammatical errors have been corrected</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Yes</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>I have checked, the results don't contain errors</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Yes</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):

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: Dr. Ir. Mamam S. TOLEBA	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi (Bénin).	
Date Manuscript Received: 30.07.21	Date Review Report Submitted: 06.08.21
Manuscript Title: Effet des doses de semis et la méthode de conduite de la pépinière sur les caractéristiques morphologiques des plantules de cinq variétés d'oignon (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.) en Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---73.05.2021---	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> 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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Le titre correspond au développement de la recherche mais peut mieux faire.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Résumé à reprendre en tenant compte des observations de l'Examineur.</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les Auteurs ont fourni un effort de collecte des informations nécessaires à la rédaction du papier, mais beaucoup de coquilles sont laissées dans le document.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Acceptable mais peut mieux faire.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les Auteurs sont priés de se conformer aux instructions contenues dans la méthodologie de rédaction d'un article scientifique. Il manque pour la plupart des tableaux et figures ou images, les sources. Des défauts de style et autres à régulariser.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>La conclusion doit pouvoir récapituler le cheminement de la pensée et faire les déductions au terme de la démonstration. Une conclusion doit faire l'état des limites et des faiblesses de l'étude. Elle suggère d'autres avenues et études permettant d'étendre les résultats ou d'avoir des applications intéressantes ou d'obtenir de meilleurs résultats pour le futur.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Il y a des références citées dans le papier sans être référencées dans la bibliographie ! Revoir également le mode de citation des auteurs à travers les séparations entre deux auteurs. Éviter d'écorcher le nom des auteurs.</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

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

Les Auteurs ont fait un effort de collecte d'informations, mais n'ont pas respecté la règle de rédaction d'un document scientifique. Tenir compte des observations de l'Examineur !

Bon courage aux Auteurs.

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

Les Auteurs sont priées de revisiter le document de "Méthodologie de rédaction d'articles scientifiques", en vue de se conformer à certaines règles de rédaction.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 16/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/08/2021
Manuscript Title: Effet des doses de semis et la méthode de conduite de la pépinière sur les caractéristiques morphologiques des plantules de cinq variétés d'oignon (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.) en Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0573/21	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
Revoir un mot dans le titre	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Des fautes grammaticales sont à corriger	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
La méthodologie n'est pas claire. Besoin encore de plus de détails	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
Le résultat doit être amélioré pour plus de compréhension	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
La conclusion est en corrélation avec le résumé	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
Doit revoir toute la référence	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

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: Moloba	
University/Country:DRC	
Date Manuscript Received:16 August 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 26 August 2021
Manuscript Title: Effet des doses de semis et la méthode de conduite de la pépinière sur les caractéristiques morphologiques des plantules de cinq variétés d'oignon (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.) en Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	5
<i>Title is right</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	5

results.	
<i>It is very well written</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>French is well written</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Correct</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Results are clear, but its discussion must be improved a little bit by comparing those results by other research results (in that Country or in the World)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3,5
<i>Context and objectives must be completed in conclusion.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Some references must be completed</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):

Congratulation. Paper is very well written and it is more understandable.