Paper: **"Evaluation des Performances Agronomiques et du Comportement de 11 Hybrides et de 3 Lignées de Sorgho (Sorghum bicolor (L) Moench) à l'Anthracnose à la Station de Farako-Bâ à l'Ouest du Burkina Faso"**

Corresponding Author: Abalo Itolou Kassankogno

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oumar Bah

Reviewer 2: Konan Aubin

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: Dr Oumar BAH - Maître Assistant CAMES	
University/Country: Sup' Management - Mali	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/10/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/10/2022
Manuscript Title: **Evaluation des performances agronomiques et comportement de 11 hybrides et de 3 lignées de sorgho à l'anthracnose à la station de Farako-Bâ à l'Ouest du Burkina Faso**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: **0980/22**	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
The title is clear and in line with the content of the study.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
The content of the study is clearly explained and presents the following elements: purpose, methods and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**

There are some grammatical errors in the study which the authors should correct before submitting the final version	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
The study methodology is very well explained	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
The result of the study is clear and free of errors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
The conclusion and summary of the study are appropriate and reflect the study.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
The bibliography is adapted and follows APA style.	

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):
Authors should correct spelling mistakes which do not detract from the quality of the study.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
This paper can be published in ESJ.

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: 22/11/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **Evaluation des performances agronomiques et comportement de 11 hybrides et de 3 lignées de sorgho à l'anthracnose à la station de Farako-Bâ à l'Ouest du Burkina Faso**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0980/22	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(The title is clearly and adequate to the content of the article)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
(The abstract is acceptable)	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
*(*There are few grammar and vocabulary mistakes*)*	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
(The study methods are clearly explained)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
(The results are acceptable but not very presented)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
(The conclusion are accurate and supported by the content)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
(The references are comprehensive and are clearly written)	

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):
Author must take into account these observations to improve the document

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: