Paper: **"Production du Mil [Pennisetum glaucum (L.) R. Br.] sur des Sols Enrichis par la Boue Résiduaire, la Fumure Bovine et l'Engrais Chimique NPK"**

Corresponding Author: Soumaila Siddo Ibrahim

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Ousmane Ndiaye
Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor, Département d'Agroforesterie, Sénégal
Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

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: Pr Ousmane Ndiaye	
University/Country:Senegal	
Date Manuscript Received: 26juillet	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **Production du mil [*Pennisetum glaucum* (L.) R. Br.] sur des sols enrichis par la boue résiduaire, la matière organique et l'engrais chimique**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 25 45 05 2023	
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**
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
The abstract should present the major results of the experiment	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
The replications are not enough instead of 3 may be 4 could work for more residuals to control the error.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)	
Discussion are not enough compared to other authors.	

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):
Fisher test is mostly more efficient than the SNK or Tuckey Tests.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: