EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute ESI
10 YEARS

Paper: **"Effet de l'Enrobage des Semences de Maïs (Zea mays L.) avec Trichoderma harzianum sur la Levée et la Croissance des Plantules au Burkina Faso"**

Submitted: 21 April 2023
Accepted: 10 August 2023
Published: 31 August 2023

Corresponding Author: Tobdem Gaston Dabire

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n24p90

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: François Manga Essouma
Institut de Recherche Agricole pour le Développement (IRAD), Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Moustapha Mounirou
Université d'Ankara, Ankara, Turquie

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

à corriger.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

ya une copie coller. A corriger.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

La grammaire est bonne.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

C'est claire.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Quelques retouches.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

A développer davantage.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Oui.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer R:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is not very clear and adequate to the content of the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

No

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

It is explicit enough.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The results are clear and explicit.

The discussion is too long.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are appropriate to the study.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1**-**5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author just needs to present the discussion better

Reviewer U:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Le tire est à améliorer. Le titre reste une phrase affirmative. Son objectif n'attire pas l'attention du lecteur, il ne suscite pas son intérêt
peut être parler de l'effet de l'enrobage des semences de ..... avec les trichoderma .....sur la lévée et la croissance .....

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Oui

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Oui

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

quelques coquilles de français et d'orthographe qui sont consignés dans le document révisé et partagés précédemment.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

oui

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

les références bibliographiques sont biens renseignés

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

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: 28/07/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/08/2023
Manuscript Title: **Enrobage des semences de Maïs avec *Trichoderma harzianum* a amélioré la levée et la croissance des plantes au Burkina Faso**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 16679	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

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) **Un très bon theme, juste quelques amendements pour sont amelioration.**	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) **Le résumé respect les norms mais une bonne partie de méthologie manqué. Les objectis de l'études sont bien fixés et la méthologie est Claire. Les résultates sont en accord avec les objectifs assignés, bien expliqués.**	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
Moins de fautes d'orthographe dans le manuscript	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) **La méthodologie est très Claire mais tros d'explication.**	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) *Les explications sont bien claires, et facile à comprendre*	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) **Dans la conclusion, les auteurs doivent inserer l'objectif general de l'étude**	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) *Les références sont bien écrites sauf que les années des publications sont entre parentheses, ce qui n'obei pas aux normes de ESJ.*	

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):

Prendre en compte ces corrections mineurs pour une bonne bublication

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: