

Paper: “Les Amandes Nues des Graines de *Detarium microcarpum* Guill. et Perr. (Fabaceae) Récoltées en Zone Soudanienne Assurent une Bonne Germination en Pépinière au Bénin, Afrique de l’Ouest”

Submitted: 10 April 2022

Accepted: 27 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Théophile Abaro Sinadouwirou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p275](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p275)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Diomande Awa
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: DIOMANDE AWA	
University/Country: Université Nangui Abrogoua/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/07/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Les amandes nues des graines de <i>Detarium microcarpum</i> Guill. et Perr. (Fabaceae) récoltées en zone soudanienne assurent une bonne régénération en pépinière au Bénin, Afrique de l'Ouest.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0443/22	
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.

<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

The title is in keeping with the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The summary responds well to objectives, method and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The manuscript presents few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Dans la discussion il faudra faire ressortir l'originalité de votre étude.

Il faudra revoir la présentation de votre méthodologie. Vous s avez semé une graine par sac, dans ces conditions es ce possible d'effectuer un test statistique, si ou donnez le test utilisé.

Au niveau des références bibliographique vous devriez vous rassurer que les références citées dans le test figurent dans la liste, et vice versa. De plus, elles devraient être présentées comme indiqué.

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: 15 th July 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 20 th July 2022
Manuscript Title: Child Recruitment and Use during Armed Conflicts by Muslims between International Law and Islamic Law	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0433/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
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.

<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>The title is appropriate for the content of the article.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Author needs to briefly describe the scientific research methodology; that is, the methods and results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are some spelling mistakes in the article, but language is clear and the style is easy understandable.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The paper is well structured and follows a reasonable logic and contains all the essential elements The structure of article and logic are within the framework of standard scientific papers. Scientific quality is based on a clear description and interpretation of relevant legal regulations, documents, etc. But, it would be preferable if the author ask some open questions (problems) and gives some answers to the research questions.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The paper is written concisely, clearly and without repetition, and the content corresponds to the chosen theme and title of the paper.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Although, the results are clearly presented, the hypotheses of the paper should be better explained. Also, it would be good to improve the conclusions of the paper, that is, to "reinforce" (improve) the conclusion of the paper.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa. Also, the list of bibliography alphabetically sorted.</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):

The paper is methodologically correct, transparent and argumentative. It raises open questions, problems, shortcomings and gaps. The paper is well written, with professionally and correctly used terminology. But also, it would be good to “improve” the conclusions of the paper, that is, it would be a good idea to "reinforce" (improve) the conclusion of the paper. It would be preferable if the author ask some open questions (problems) and gives some answers to the research questions.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: