

Paper: “Optimisation de l’Evaluation de la Biomasse Fourragère en Zone Sahélienne Grâce à l’Utilisation de la Méthode de Régression Linéaire Multiple en Conjonction Avec la Stratification”

Submitted: 18 October 2023

Accepted: 15 November 2023

Published: 30 November 2023

Corresponding Author: Abdourahamane Zakari Seybou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n33p52](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n33p52)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Moustapha Mounirou
Institut National de Recherche Agronomique du Niger

Reviewer 2: Ismael Bio
University of Diffa, Niger

Reviewer 3: Pocoun Damè Kombienou
Institut National des Recherches Agricoles du Bénin

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: Ismael Bio	
University/Country: Niger	
Date Manuscript Received:30/10/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 3/11/2023
Manuscript Title: Optimisation de l'évaluation de la biomasse fourragère en zone sahélienne grâce à l'utilisation de la méthode de Régression linéaire Multiple en conjonction avec la stratification	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 49968-1	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Title too long. The authors have done some modeling. So the title must be changed	
I suggest « Evaluation de la biomasse fourragère par Régression linéaire Multiple en conjonction avec la stratification en zone sahélienne »	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Abstract too long	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Authors should avoid using personal pronouns in the manuscript	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
I would have liked to see some graphs especially the regression graphs.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The authors brought back results in the conclusion why is too long	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes

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

Yes

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]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

5

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):

Take into account some minor formal observations for the quality of the article

Reviewer K:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Le titre est clair.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Demande de quelques corrections.

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

Très bien écrit.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

parfait.

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

Pas assez des erreurs.

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

Bonne conclusion.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Demande des références récentes pour enrichir le document.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

5

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):
