

Paper: “Caractérisation Agronomique des Arbres Performants d’Anacardiens (Anacardium occidentale L.), Sélectionnés dans les Zones de Production au Togo”

Submitted: 29 March 2023

Accepted: 17 August 2023

Published: 31 August 2023

Corresponding Author: Banla Tèkondo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n24p141](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n24p141)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Monssou Eugène Oulaïtar
UFHB, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: 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: Dr. Monssou	
University/Country: UFHB, Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 28-07-23	Date Review Report Submitted: 01-08-23
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation agronomiques des arbres élites anacardier (Anacardium occidentale L.) sélectionnés des zones de production au Togo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 02	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>(The title is not clear, it must be correct)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(The methods are acceptable but the results are not clear)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Yes, there are few grammatical errors in this article)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(The study methods are acceptable)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(No, the results are not clear)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(the conclusion and the summary are acceptable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(No, the references must take again)</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):

I would like the author to repeat some parts.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: