



Paper: “Effects of organic fertilizers and tillage on yield and its components of three varieties of *Corchorus olitorius* L. produced in South Benin”

Submitted: 25 January 2024

Accepted: 29 January 2025

Published: 31 January 2025

Corresponding Author: Faton Manhognon Oscar Euloge

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n3p164

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Belamalem Souad

University Ibn Tofail, Faculty of Science, Kenitra, Morocco

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: Belamalem Souad	
University/Country: University Ibn Tofail, Faculty of Science, Kenitra, Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 15-01-2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 19-01-2025
Manuscript Title: Effects of organic fertilizers and tillage on yield and its components of three varieties of <i>Corchorus olitorius</i> L. produced in South Benin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0148/25	
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 the article.	4
The title reflects the aim of the study	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
The abstract is brief, it usually presents the main parts of the article	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>It's good</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The methodology of this work is clear; compressive, it brings a lot of information	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusion is clear and gives a general idea of the results obtained	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
the references respect the standards of the journal	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This manuscript is clear, well structured, the methodology well explained. It meets scientific standards so it will require further publication in your journal after the corrections I have submitted to you.