

Paper: “Agromorphological Characterization of Hibiscus sabdariffa L. Collection from Burkina Faso”

Submitted: 01 March 2022

Accepted: 12 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Ouangraoua Wendpingrenoma Jocelyne

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p184](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p184)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Carlos Alberto Batista Santos
Universidade do Estado da Bahia, Brazil

Reviewer 2: Zagre M’bi Bertin
Institut De L’environnement Et De Recherches Agricoles, Burkina Faso



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: ZAGRE M'BI BERTIN	
University/Country: Institut de l'Environnement et de Recherches Agricoles/Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/03/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 31/3/2022
Manuscript Title: Agromorphological variability of a collection of <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> L. from Burkina Faso.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0331/22	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
In view of the study carried out, we propose the following title : "Agromorphological characterization of <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> L. collection from Burkina Faso"	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results but the author does not specify the period of study	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
According to this part, we consider that the author has made a considerable effort because we note a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
In terms of the characters measured, the author should have indicated when? How and on which units were the measurements taken? What is also the expression of the collected data?	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are clearly presented, supported by illustrations such as tables, figures and photos	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
As for the conclusion, we believe that the main results should be given taking into account the three specific objectives formulated in the introduction	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The authors in the references are sufficiently provided and recent to support the results obtained. There are two authors quoted in the text who do not appear in the references and one author in the references who is not quoted in the text.	

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):

At the end of this evaluation of the manuscript, here are the comments and suggestions that we offer to the authors with the aim of improving the text. Some corrections were made in the text.

- In the study, the author speaks of the evaluation of accessions. This is actually a characterization. In an evaluation we do it in relation to a reference, that is to say a check and here this is not the case and therefore, we propose the following title: “Agromorphological characterization of *Hibiscus sabdariffa* L. collection from Burkina faso »
- In terms of the characters measured, the author should have indicated when? How and on which units were the measurements taken? What is also the expression of the collected data?
- The authors Pernes (1986) in the last paragraph of the introduction and Ferchichi (2007) in the third paragraph before the end of the discussion do not appear in the references
- The author Aljane F. & Ferchini A. (2007) in references is not cited in the document
- The figures 2, 3 and again 2 which must be 4 are without source. Aren't figures 2, 3 and 4 photos?
- Tables 3 and 5 present the analysis of variance of the different traits. Instead of F, I suggest that we put P-value because with F we cannot assess whether there are significant differences or not.
- Table 2 was cited before figures 2, 3 and 4 and should be placed before them. Similarly figure 6 is cited in the text before Table 4 and should come before it.

- For the conclusion, it would be appropriate to give the main results in relation to the three specific objectives formulated. We could say:
 - with regard to the identification of the differential characters of accessions, we note that
 - concerning the determination of the relationships between the studied characters, we retain that.....
 - for the establishment of the level and structure of the diversity of the accessions collected, it appears that.....

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

- Make the note to the authors available to reviewers.
- With regard to each evaluation element, we could add the discussion

