

Paper: “Effets des Amendements Organiques sur la Gale Bactérienne et la Pourriture Apicale de la Tomate à Bobo-Dioulasso au Burkina Faso”

Submitted: 29 May 2023

Accepted: 08 November 2023

Published: 30 November 2023

Corresponding Author: Oumarou Traore

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n33p17](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n33p17)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yao Jean-Clovis Kouadio
Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Kassankogno Abalo Itolou
Phytopathologist, Chargé de recherche CNRST, Maroc

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

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

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The problem has not been clearly posed.
The methodology is not well explained.
No data on the results have been illustrated.

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

There are mistakes:

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

As the titles and subtitles are set out in the text, it is difficult to follow the author.
Under this heading (2.3. Fertilisants), the author should describe the treatments.
Under this heading (2.4. Dispositif expérimental)
The number in Table 1 does not correspond to the number in the text.

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

Keeping track of the document is a little difficult, so it would be more interesting to number the titles and subtitles.
in headings 3.2; 3.3; 3.4, the author should insert data on the results in the analyses.
Figure 5 would be more interesting if the author had added data on tomato production per treatment.

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

The second sentence of the conclusion is not consistent with the work carried out in this study.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references comprises a total of 23.
All references cited.

55% of these references are over 10 years old, and only 35 are less than 10 years old in this article.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

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]

3

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]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article is good overall, but the author will have to correct and take into account the few remarks that have been suggested.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title corresponds to the content of the work

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

That the author take into account my remarks made in the document

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

The article contains a few spelling mistakes to be taken into account

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

YES

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

YES

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

YES

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

YES

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

5

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]

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):

That the author takes into account the corrections mentioned in the article.

Reviewer G:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

yes, the content relates to the title of the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

yes

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

grammatical and spelling errors have been corrected in the document.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Corrections have been made to improve understanding. With regard to statistical analysis, the test used needs to be reviewed.

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

Yes

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

yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Each in-text citation has been included in the list of reference excepted this one "International Mycological Institue, 1983".

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

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]

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]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
