

Paper: “Germination Stage Screening of Mutants of Cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L. Walp) to Salinity Tolerance”

Submitted: 08 March 2021

Accepted: 08 June 2022

Published: 30 September 2022

Corresponding Author: Deme Ndeye Fatou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n30p73](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n30p73)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hammouda Dounia
University Mentouri-Constantine1, Algeria

Reviewer 2: Hodo-Abalo Tossim
Peanut Breeding Program, Ceraas, Thiès, Senegal

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: 11/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/04/2021
Manuscript Title: Germination Stage screening of mutants of cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> L.) to salinity tolerance	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0351/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: /No	
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>	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
the author must put the scientific name of the species studied better than its common name in the title.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The summary is well written and clear.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
yes There are few grammatical errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Yes the methodology used in this study is well described	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
the results are well interpreted	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
Bibliographic research is very rich and recent.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author must add a descriptive table that includes his plant material (38 genotypes).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: 21/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/05/2021
Manuscript Title: Germination Stage screening of mutants of cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> L. Walp) to salinity tolerance	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0351/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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 author must put the scientific name of the species studied in the brackets	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
A little effort must be made to present the study objectives, the material, methods and design used and bring out the key result of the study and its impact on the improvement of Cowpea tolerance to salt stress.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Yes, if it is possible, it is better that an expert in English read the article	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Yes, the methodology used is well described	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Results are well presented and interpreted but a little effort must be made in the discussion as was indicated in the test	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Yes.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
Yes	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Author must put the detailed list of the material including the checks

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: