Paper: **"Effet de la Profondeur de Semis des Semences sur la Qualité Germinative des Graines de Pterocarpus Erinaceus Poir., 1804 (Fabaceae)"**

Corresponding Author: Yao Patrice Houphouet

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yao Akoua Clémentine
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Bamba N'Golo
University Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'Ivoire

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: YAO Akoua Clémentine	
University/Country: Université NANGUI ABROGOUA/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received:21/07/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/07/2022
Manuscript Title: **Effet de la profondeur de semis des semences sur la qualité germinative des graines de Pterocarpus erinaceus Poir., 1804 (Fabaceae)**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 15533-Article Text-45231-1-4-20220707	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: **Yes** Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Yes** Yes/No You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Yes** 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.	**5**

(Please insert your comments) **The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article**	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) The abstract is clear and it present main part	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) **The autor will find all my proposition in the text concerning grammatical errors and over**	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) I think that the author should complete the method. I ask him many question. The answers of those questions can contribute to improve his method.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) **The results are clean**	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) The conclusions or summary are accurate	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) The references are comprehensive and appropriate	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**Yes**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

All my comments and suggestions are in the text. If the author take account, it can contribute to improve the paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I think that his manuscript is good because it gives many solutions to determine the germination quality of the seeds of *Pterocarpus erinaceus* (plant species of high commercial value).