

**Paper: “Effet de l’apiculture sur les Plantations d’anacardiers (*Anacardium Occidentale L.*) dans les Regions de Sedhiou et Kolda au Sud du Senegal”**

**Submitted: 11 May 2023**

**Accepted: 29 August 2023**

**Published: 31 August 2023**

Corresponding Author: Athanase Diatta

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n24p222](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n24p222)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yaya Diatta

University Assane Seck, Senegal

Reviewer 2: Tiendrebeogo Nebnoma Romaric

Université Nazi Boni, Burkina Faso

-----  
Reviewer L:  
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review  
-----

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

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

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

A lot of corrections to make.

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

Yes

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methodology needs to be better explained. It should aim to achieve the objectives set.

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

the body of the text contains errors.

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

To be improved

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

References are incomplete for the whole.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

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

3

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

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

2

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

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

2

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

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

1

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

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

You need to read a lot and understand the subject. Know what problem you're trying to solve and use the methodology to get there.

-----

# 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: Yaya DIATTA	
University/Country: University Assane Seck/ Senegal	
Date Manuscript Received: 19/07/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/07/2023
Manuscript Title: <b>EFFET DE L'APICULTURE SUR LES PLANTATIONS D'ANACARDIERS (<i>Anacardium occidentale</i> L.) DANS LES REGIONS DE SEDHIOU ET KOLDA AU SUD DU SENEGAL</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 16746	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.

<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>4</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>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):** on the whole, the document has been very well written. however, the authors need to make a few corrections to improve the quality of the document. the different parts are well respected in the document and a scientific approach has also been followed. Thank you

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

the editors on the whole have really respected the various parties involved. I suggest that they integrate and take into account the various recommendations made in the document.