

Paper: “Efficacité et Rentabilité de L’utilisation du Compost à Base de Fiente de Poulet dans la Production de Plants d’hévéa de Pépinière en Sac”

Submitted: 09 May 2022

Accepted: 27 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Adou Bini Yao Christophe

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p366](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p366)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Konan Evrard Brice Dibi

Centre National de Recherche Agronomique (CNRA), Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Meddich Abdelilah

Cadi Ayyad University Marrakech, Morocco

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: 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: Konan Evrard Brice DIBI	
University/Country: Centre National de Recherche Agronomique (CNRA) / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 22/06/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/07/2022
Manuscript Title: Production optimale et rentable de plants d'hévéa de pépinière en sac par l'utilisation du compost à base de fiente de poulet	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0538/22	
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.	3
<i>The title is clear but can be improved. I made a suggestion for a new title</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Good</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The methodology is not clearly explained. This part of the document should be reorganized</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results were relatively well presented</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Yes</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):

Good scientific work. Take into account the suggestions and reorganize some parts of the document for its improvement.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Good work that deserves to be published

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: Meddich Abdelilah	
University/Country: Cadi Ayyad University Marrakech, Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: August 03, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: August 06, 2022
Manuscript Title: Production optimale et rentable de plants d'hévéa de pépinière en sac par l'utilisation du compost à base de fiente de poulet	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 38.05.2022	
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
The Title is concise, clear, informative and appropriate to the content of the paper.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<p>-The abstract does not present the method used to answer the research objective and question.</p> <p>-The abstract does not clearly present the results. For example, low-dose compost improved vegetative growth and economic profitability, but it would be better to specify in which parameters this improvement occurred and at what level.</p> <p>- Regarding the keywords, the word optimal dose should be added because this word presents the objective of the study. However, the word Côte d'Ivoire is included in the keywords even if it is not mentioned in the abstract.</p> <p>Other important remarks</p> <p>*Better give information about the compost used, at least its origin here in the summar</p> <p>*You need to boost your summary by adding the % increase when applying effective doses (S2/S4) compared to the non-compost amended control</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. Please see the original document with my remarks and corrections	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<p>The study methods are clearly explained. Just additional information about compost analysis should be added such as: electrical conductivity and organic matter.</p> <p>Another important point: Please check in the revised Manuscript, and respond with further details and arguments. I regret that you did not test compost rates < to 20 tons/ha</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<p>The results are presented in a clear and understandable way, just show the statistical significance.</p> <p>See other remarks in Manuscript</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The conclusions are exact but see my remarks in Manuscript (the question of water as a limiting factor is to be deleted because you have not studied this parameter).	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2

-The following reference is mentioned in the main text, but they are not added to the reference list:

(Boli et al., 2000).

-The species name *zea mays* should be written in italics in reference 19.

-To maintain consistency between references, journal names should be written in full and not abbreviated (Case of reference: 6, 19, 20, 24, and 25).

- I regret to note that your discussion is not really consistent and especially it does not contain recent references with high IF.

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):

Interesting article that answers an important research question. But some details and arguments are missing and it is necessary to correct this version according to my remarks. Also, please make the remarks mentioned above, and also to better develop the discussion by expressing in depth the mechanisms of action with recent references.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: