

Paper: “Effet des Prétraitements sur la Germination des Semences de *Azelia africana* Smith ex Pers. en Milieu Semi Contrôlé en Basse Casamance (Senegal)”

Submitted: 01 July 2023

Accepted: 15 August 2023

Published: 31 October 2023

Corresponding Author: Aly Diallo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n30p216](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n30p216)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Saint Fedriche Ndzaï

Université Marien Ngouabi, Brazzaville, République du Congo

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: NDZAI Saint Fédriche	
University/Country: Université Marien Ngouabi, Brazzaville, République du Congo	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/09/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/09/2023
Manuscript Title: Effet des prétraitements sur la germination des semences de <i>Azelia africana</i> Smith ex Pers	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 57.08.2023	
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.

<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.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre un bon, mais il manque le pays d'étude et le lieu d'expérimentation	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Le résumé est bien structure, il est juste nécessaire de séparer les valeurs et les pourcentages</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Moins de fautes d'orthographe	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il manque la description du milieu d'étude ainsi que la localisation du site	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Très bon résultats	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il manque la phrase qui indique importance de d'étude	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Il maque les numéros de page pour ceratines références</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Prendre en compte ces corrections mineurs pour une bonne publication. C'est un article mérité d'être publié dans les meilleurs délais.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Les éditeurs doivent tenir compte des remarques faites pour ce manuscript afin d'assurer la qualité de la revue.