

**Paper: “Effet de la nature du substrat sur le développement des plants de palmier à huile C1001F (*Elaeis Guineensis* Jacq.) en condition de stress hydrique”**

**Submitted: 12 June 2023**

**Accepted: 01 August 2023**

**Published: 31 August 2023**

Corresponding Author: Obed Dessan Gogue

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n24p262](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n24p262)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Konan Aubin

Université Nangui Abrogoua, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Kouakou Séraphin Konan

Université Alassane Ouattara, Ivory Coast

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: 30/06/2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>Effet de différents substrats en période de stress hydrique dans la croissance des plants de palmier à huile C1001F (<i>Elaeis Guineensis</i> Jacq.) en Côte d'Ivoire</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0654/23	
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>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The title isn't very clearly and adequate to the content of the article)</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>1,5</b>
<i>(The abstract is not clearly and isn't present the objects, methods and results.)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(There are many grammatical errors and vocabulary mistakes in this article.)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(The study methods are not clearly explained)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(The results are not acceptable but not very presented.)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(The conclusion are not accurate and not supported by the content)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2.5</b>
<i>(The references are comprehensive and are not clearly written)</i>	

**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):**

**Author** must take into account these observations to improve the document

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

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Kouakou Séraphin KONAN	
University/Country: Université Alassane OUATTARA / Ivory Coast	
Date Manuscript Received: 01/07/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/07/2023
Manuscript Title: <b>Effet de différents substrats en période de stress hydrique dans la croissance des plants de palmier à huile C1001F (<i>Elaeis Guineensis</i> Jacq.) en Côte d'Ivoire</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number : The number is not mentioned	
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]

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The title is acceptable. However, suggest this « Effet de la nature du substrat sur le développement des plants de palmier à huile C1001F (Elaeis Guineensis Jacq.) en situation de stress hydrique »</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The summary is poorly structured. The objective and the results are not clearly presented. I made some suggestions.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Some sentences are poorly formulated. There is also some unnecessary text that needs to be removed. I've crossed out these sentences and paragraphs. I reworded some sentences to make it clear what they mean.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The method is acceptable</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>They have to take over the presentation of the results. I've made some recommendations</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>the conclusions is acceptable. However, it must take account what I've brought to it.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>acceptable</i>	

**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):**

The subject is relevant insofar as it allows agricultural residues to be valorized. However, I got the impression that the co-authors didn't read the article before submission. Before submitting an article for publication, you should have it read by others, which could reduce the evaluation time and the risk of rejection.

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

Thank you for trusting me by sending me this article for review. I would like you to bring it back to me when the author resubmits.