

**Paper: “Estimates of Genetic Variability in a Collection of Amaranths
(Amaranthus spp) Cultivated in Burkina Faso”**

Submitted: 21 February 2022

Accepted: 11 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Jacques Ouedraogo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p165](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p165)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Maria Clideana Cabral Maia
EMBRAPA, Brazil

Reviewer 2: Dieni Zakaria
INERA research station Farako Ba, Burkina Faso

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is concise and reflect the content of the manuscript

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The keys information required for and introduction is well presented

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

Yes, there are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes that should be addressed by authors

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology used in this study is fairly well developed. Maximum details have been provided. Suggestions et questions are mentioned in the manuscript for authors attention.

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

The general structure of the manuscript is good. Results are well presented and are consistent with the research question. The discussion is based on the findings. However, proof reading is required. Authors are encouraged to consider suggestions made in the manuscript to improve the quality of the paper.

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

The conclusion is concise and consistent with the content of the paper.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Most references are relevant and up to date. However, must ensure that all references cited int ext are listed in the list of references and vice versa.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

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: Maria Clideana Cabral Maia	
University/Country: EMBRAPA/BRAZIL	
Date Manuscript Received: March 1st	Date Review Report Submitted: 2022/28/04
Manuscript Title: Estimates of genetic variability for quantitative parameters in a collection of amaranths (<i>Amaranthus ssp</i>) cultivated in Burkina Faso.	
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.	5
<i>(Yes, is appropriate)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(the abstract does not include the description of methods)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Yes)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(The authors had not reported the description, at least, succinct of the methodology of cluster analysis)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(the authors had not mentioned the relations among variables observed in the graphical analysis, for example, in the first figure the variables LOL and FLO presented one interdependence relation seeing the angle of the 90° observed among the variables)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(yes)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(I made not this conference)</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This work has a theoretical potential to support the start of one selective process with amaranths (*Amaranthus ssp*) in Burkina Faso. However, need more fundamentals and details, mainly in relation to the behavior of the variables in the graphical analysis. But, the presented results justify his publication.