

Paper: "Amélioration de la conservation de la papaye (Carica papaya L.), variété Solo Golden, à la température ambiante par l'utilisation de films polyéthyléniques"

Submitted: 05 August 2024 Accepted: 24 October 2024 Published: 31 October 2024

Corresponding Author: Ouattara Tieba Victor

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n30p185

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abdou Habou M. Kamal Université de Diffa, Niger

Reviewer 2: N'dri Kouassi Jacob

Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé, Côte d'Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Kouassi N'dri Jacob			
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire			
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:		
16/10/2024	23/10/2024		
Manuscript Title: Amélioration de la durée de conservation de la papaye			
(Carica papaya L.), variété Solo Golden, post-récolte entreposée à la			
température ambiante par l'utilisation des films polyéthyléniques comme			
emballage			
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0846/24			
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:			
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of	4
the article.	·
The title is clear and in line with the content. However, we propose that it be titled	

The title is clear and in line with the content. However, we propose that it be titled as follows: Use of polyethylene films as packaging for improving the post-harvest shelf life of papaya (Carica papaya L), variety Solo Golden, stored at room temperature)

2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. | 5

(The objectives, methods and results are well presented in the abstract. In addition, it was noted that these results constitute for these authors a starting point for new research on the conservation of papaya. This abstract is therefore well structured.)

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling	4	
mistakes in this article.	4	
We only observe minor errors that do not affect the quality of the work. These		
small errors absolutely must be corrected)		
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4	
The study methods are well translated. However, the description of the method of		
conditioning papayas was too brief. From this step could appear the fungi observed		
during the experiments)		
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5	
We have not observed any errors unless we have missed them)		
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and	5	
supported by the content.	3	
The conclusion and summary are well-conducted, precise and understandable)		
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5	
References comply with the conditions set out in the authors	' guide.)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Il faudra bien décrire le conditionnement des fruits, corriger les petites erreurs d'inattention et améliore le titre de la publication dans le sens de la proposition ci-dessus indiquée.