

Paper: “Valorisation Energetique des Dechets Agricoles : cas de la Pomme de Cajou dans le Departement de Tanda (Côte d’Ivoire)”

Submitted: 10 June 2022

Accepted: 08 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Lydie C. Mangoua-Allali

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p142](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p142)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Saturnin Degnon
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Coulibaly Sandotin Lassina
Université de Man, Cote d'Ivoire

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: Saturnin DEGNON	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi (Bénin)	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/07/2022
Manuscript Title: VALORISATION ENERGETIQUE DES DECHETS AGRICOLES: CAS DE LA POMME DE CAJOU DE TANDA (COTE 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.	3
Pour le titre mettre Cas de la pomme de cajou dans le Département de Tanda et non cajou de Tanda	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
Reprendre le résumé en trois points: objectif de la recherche, breve presentation l'approche méthodologique adoptee et les principaux résultats	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<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 type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

La présentation de l'article n'a pas falicité l'examen. L'article est mal numéroté, le résumé et la discussion ne sont pas bien faits.

Suggestion : corriger les observations faites dans le document : les figures, photos, tableaux. Reprendre le résumé, la discussion et adopter la numérotation proposée.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Coulibaly Sandotin Lassina	
University/Country: Université de Man	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/07/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: VALORISATION ENERGETIQUE DES DECHETS AGRICOLES : CAS DE LA POMME DE CAJOU DE TANDA (COTE D'IVOIRE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0635/22	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>les corrections son en rouge et les commentaries en bleue dans le texte</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>RAS</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>RAS</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>RAS</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>RAS</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):

RAS

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

RAS

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 23 rd June 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 27 th June 2022
Manuscript Title: VALORISATION ENERGETIQUE DES DECHETS AGRICOLES : CAS DE LA POMME DE CAJOU DE TANDA (COTE D'IVOIRE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 35.06.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No	
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.	3
<i>The title of the paper is accurate with the purpose of the study stated in the manuscript. But, there is difference with cashew apple and cashew apple shells.</i>	

<i>The waste reuse in this study is shell and not cashew apple. The cashew apple is the fruit and shell is waste after use cashew.</i>	
<i>I proposal the new Title: ENERGY RECOVERY FROM AGRICULTURAL WASTE: THE CASE OF CASHEW SHELL FROM TANDA (COTE D'IVOIRE)</i>	
<i>Titre: VALORISATION ENERGETIQUE DES DECHETS AGRICOLES : CAS DE LA COQUE DE DE CAJOU DE TANDA (COTE D'IVOIRE)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>This section clearly describes the experiment conducted by the authors to show the energy recovery from agricultural waste: the case of cashew shell from Tanda (Côte d'Ivoire).</i>	
<i>The objectives are clearly stated (e.i. main objective and specific objectives).</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Grammar and spelling are improved.)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(The experiments are described and documented as implemented in the field.)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(These results correspond to objective. On the other hand, the results are clear and their significance is easy to understand.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(The authors present the most relevant findings of the paper and explain its applicability. This section is very concise and well written down.)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(The references are comprehensive, appropriate and recently.)</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):

Dear authors - your paper has some exciting results that really should be published. However, there are some fundamental issues with the paper that need to be addressed before it can be accepted for publication. I found that there is a

confusion cashew apple and cashew shell. You have used cashew shell and not cashew apple during your study. In fact, the shell is the waste from cashew apple. In this manuscript, you should be change cashew apple by cashew shell for best comprehension.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: