

Manuscript: **“Post-Harvest Management Practices Of Bambara Groundnut (Vigna Subterranea (L.) Verdc) Seeds In Burkina Faso”**

Submitted: 04 February 2022

Accepted: 03 April 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: S. Amidou OUILI

Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n14p228

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Laurent Lamulle

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Laurent Lamulle

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-02-16 04:27 PM

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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.

*** The title of the article is clear and does not need to be reworded**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*** The Abstract of the article is well elaborated with presentation of the problem, the objective, the method and the results obtained.**

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

Minor errors

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*** There is very little explanation of the sampling. The method of selecting sites and producers needs to be further explained. Data collection should be moved out of the study environment section.**

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

*** The body of the article is well formulated. We propose only at the level of results to give the active ingredient of the proposed chemicals. The commercial name can change from one supplier to another.**

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

*** The conclusion is well formulated and takes into account the body of the article**

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*** The reference is well formulated according to the guidelines for authors**

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):

We suggest that the author consider the comments regarding:

- Detailed explanation of the sampling of sites and producers surveyed;
- Moving a few paragraphs from the study area to the data collection section;
- The insertion of the active ingredients of the chemical products for the conservation of the product.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer Files

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.

*** Title appears too long. Needs to be shortened for clarity. While rural areas is used in the title, rural or rural areas not used much in the paper.**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*** Several issues with the abstract. Missing detailed reason for why post harvest techniques needed. Authors are using post-harvest (in the body of text) and postharvest (in the title), need to decide which term will be used for consistency throughout the paper.**

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

Several grammatical errors as well as numerous errors using APA 7th edition for in-text citations and for the reference list and for Tables and Figures. Suggest Authors thoroughly review APA 7th edition to make all of these corrections to greatly improve the manuscript.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*** Missing clear recruitment of participants for the study. Use of farmers may be best to use respondents (only suggestion) but not use of 'them' and 'they'. Refer**

to APA for reporting numbers such as using 09, when it should be nine sites....(line 89)

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

* The body of the paper has several unclear sections in need for correction i.e., headings Data Analyses suggested rather than Data collection and statistical analyses, since Data collection should be a separate heading from Analyses. (line 110)

Table content headings are unclear and use of decimal spaces

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

* More details needed in the conclusion. How will training and or education be provided to the farmers (respondents) on how to use the harvesting techniques since it was stated many are illiterate?

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

* Ensure that References first follows APA and then ensure that all citations are listed in the references 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):

The topic and purpose of the paper is of great importance. It is suggested the authors give a stronger case for the need based on what has occurred previously for the farmers. Also, more information on how adoption of the practices was provided. How receptive were respondents to this new technique. Need to include more information on the qualitative approach (interviews), no dates and transcription included. how long were the interviews, how many participants during the interviews or how often interviews conducted.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I am interested in the topic when it applies to training and educating farmers, etc. however, the authors are in need of making major revisions to the paper to make it for the Journal for publication.