

**Paper: “Effet du mode de semis et de la couleur des accessions d’anacardier (Anacardium occidentale L.) sur le rendement en noix au Nord-Est du Bénin”**

**Submitted: 13 May 2022**

**Accepted: 28 June 2022**

**Published: 31 July 2022**

Corresponding Author: Aboudou Djalidou Salifou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n24p149](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n24p149)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Adifon Fiacre  
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, RP Cotonou, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Diallo Seydou  
IPR/IFRA, Mali

Reviewer 3: Blinded

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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 ADIFON Fiacre	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/0200	Date Review Report Submitted: 06 06/2022
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Effet du mode de semis et de la couleur des accessions d'anacardier ( <i>Anacardium Occidental L.</i> ) sur le rendement en noix au Nord-Est du Bénin	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	

## 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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

The cashew tree has two fruits: the cashew nut and the cashew apple. Please make sure to specify in the text what is meant by fruits in your manuscript

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

The paper can be accepted for publication subject to the consideration of suggestions which are just reformulations of the author's ideas and which do not detract from the scientific quality of the manuscript

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: DIALLO Seydou	
University/Country: IPR/IFRA /Mali	
Date Manuscript Received: 04 juin 2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0545/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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>5</b>
à mon humble avis le titre est clair et correspond parfaitement au contenu de l'article	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
Après lecture de la section résumé, on constate que les objets, les méthodes et les resultants sont presents de façon succincte et logique. Mais les resultants donnés ne sont pas chiffrés.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
Il y a très peu d'erreurs grammaticales et de fautes d'orthographe dans cet article.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	
Il y a quelques insuffisances au niveau de la méthodologie, notamment les différentes techniques ou méthodes utilisées pour collecter les données sur le terrain. Il est important d'illustrer d'avantage la partie méthodologique.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	
Les résultats sont bien agencés, clairs et précis.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	
Les resultats obtenus sont utiles. Ils peuvent être appliqués à la population d'étude. Ils sont restés à la limite de l'étude. Elle est concluante.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
Pour les references le nombre est satisfaisant et chacune a apporté un éclairage important au texte.	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Les auteurs ont abattu un travail scientifique et de qualité. Ils ont produit un article concis rigoureux, et lisible, agréable à lire par les lecteurs.

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