

**Paper: “Prospection, Enquête et Collectes des Accessions de Poivron (*Capsicum annum L.*) Cultivés dans la Région de Diffa, Niger”**

**Submitted: 19 September 2022**

**Accepted: 29 January 2023**

**Published: 31 January 2023**

Corresponding Author: Saley Moussa Diagara

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n3p189](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n3p189)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Younoussou Rabo  
Université de Diffa, Niger

Reviewer 2: Tape Bi Sehi Antoine  
University Peleforo Gon Coulibaly, Ivory Coast

Reviewer 3: 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!*

Date Manuscript Received: 18/11/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/12/2022
Manuscript Title: Prospection, Enquête et Collectes des Accessions de Poivron ( <i>Capsicum annuum</i> L.) Cultivés dans la Région de Diffa, Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1010/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Non	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**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 integrate the observations to improve the quality of the manuscript

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# 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: 16/ 12/ 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/12/2022
Manuscript Title: Prospection, Enquête et Collectes des Accessions de Poivron ( <i>Capsicum annuum</i> L. Cultivés dans la Région de Diffa, Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 10.10.2022 (1)	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	4
Titre en adéquations avec le contenu du document	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	3

Le résumé est à réécrire car comprenant des pans entier du document alors qu'il devait contenir seulement une situation problème ( pas obligatoire), l'objectif, la méthodologie et les résultats	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Bonne rédaction et moins de fautes grammaticales	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
Méthodologie conforme à l'étude.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
Les résultats ont été bien présentés. Cependant, la partie discussion est à reprendre. Les résultats n'ont pas été interprétés et comparer aux résultats obtenus par d'autres chercheurs.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
Bonne conclusion	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
La référence doit être améliorée en y ajoutant le pays où la ville de publication des différents ouvrages. De plus elle paraît volumineuse et les auteurs ne sont pas tous indiqués dans le corps du document s'y trouvent.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Mais avez-vous vraiment lu tous ces auteurs consignés dans la bibliographie ? Nous vous exhortons à lire suffisamment afin d'améliorer votre discussion

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**