

Manuscript: “**Effects of Two Cover Crops [Arachis Repens (L.) Handro And Desmodium Adscendens (SW.) DC.] on The Density of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi in Soils Under Industrial Banana Plantations in Côte d'Ivoire**”

**Submitted: 20 December 2021**

**Accepted: 01 February 2022**

**Published: 31 March 2022**

Corresponding Author: **Kosso Nina Reine BOKA**

Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n11p222

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Blinded

**Reviewer 2:** Abdelkader Tadjia, Ibn badis Mostaganem Algérie

# ***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: 15-02-2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 21-02-2022
<p>Manuscript Title: <b>Effects of two cover crops [<i>Arachis repens</i> (L.) <i>Handro</i> and <i>Desmodium adscendens</i> (SW.) DC.] on the density of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in soils under industrial banana plantations in Côte d'Ivoire</b></p>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 75.11.2021	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The title of this manuscript is very clear.</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>All the parts of the summary are there</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Very few errors. But, avoid using abbreviations in the titles of tables and figures.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
The study methods are explained clearly.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The results are well presented. Except that the picture of the mycorrhizal fungus spores is of poor quality.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Very good conclusion. However, I find that the perspective is very hasty...</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The references cited in the text are in accordance with those in the "References" section</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

Just a few small grammatical errors. This does not detract from the quality of the study

The study is very interesting.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

This study is to be published.

# ***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: tadja	
University/Country: Ibn badis Mostaganem Algérie	
Date Manuscript Received: 17 12 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 01 -01 2022
Manuscript Title: <b>Effects of two cover crops (<i>Arachis repens</i> and <i>Desmodium adscendens</i>) on the density of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in soils under industrial banana plantations in Côte d'Ivoire</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1175/21	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2</b>
title adapted to the subject , the title should be worded as follows: effects of the	

presence of two legume crops ( <i>Arachis repens</i> and <i>Desmodium adscendens</i> ) on the population density of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on banana in soils in Côte d'Ivoire	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
the summary reflects the objectives of the article, with comparison results between these two cover crops on the fungal count, but which do not give scientific explanations	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>02</b>
the methods are clear but remain less developed or the cultivation techniques applied	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>02</b>
the results are just comparison numbers without any scientific approach explaining the differences and the number	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>01</b>
the conclusion is not well developed with errors regarding soil fertility with cover crops and the population of these fungi	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>03</b>
) the bibliographical references are insufficient especially on the aspect of symbiotic and mychorhizogenic relationship of these fungi with the culture of the banana tree	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

your work is interesting insofar as you would understand the interests of mycorrhization in the host plant, and also the factors influencing the multiplication of these fungi in the soil and the host plant

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

