

**Paper: “Response of Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) Varieties to Critical Period of Crop-Weed Interference in West Coast Region of The Gambia”**

**Submitted: 17 January 2025**

**Accepted: 14 March 2025**

**Published: 30 April 2025**

Corresponding Author: S.A.F. Jallow

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n12p73

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Arlinda Ymeraj  
European University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Blinded

### **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!***

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>RESPONSE OF GROUNDNUT (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.) TO CRITICAL PERIOD OF CROP - WEED INTERFERENCE IN WEST COAST REGION OF THE GAMBIA</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Non	
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: Oui	

### **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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Il faudra insérer une carte bien détaillée de la zone d'étude ; et les variables climatiques (pluviométrie et température) expliquées par une figure (diagramme ombrothermique de la zone d'étude par exemple), faire les interprétations des éléments et signifier les variabilités climatiques observées recensement dans la</i>	

zone, afin de mieux cerner l'importance cette étude qui est la réponse ou la résilience de l'arachide ou de certaines variétés face au changement climatique ou à la sécheresse dans la zone ou dans le pays.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Je préfère que les résultats soient dissociés de la discussion. C'est à dire présenter les résultats d'abord et après faire discussion)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Il faudra faire plus de recherché pour améliorer le document surtout avec de récents travaux. J'ai constaté que les mêmes auteurs ont été cités plusieurs fois à travers le document)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

-----  
Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

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

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract clearly presents methods, while the objectives and results are missing.

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

There are some spelling mistakes in this article.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The study methods are explained very clearly, but in a very high professional language. I am not sure whether any readers may have the same level of understanding.

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

The body of the paper is clear, but the authors have paid more attention to the construction of tables rather than the interpretation of the results. I have provided comments in this regard in the article.

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

The conclusion is very superficial, not supported with the appropriate evidence.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The list of reference is appropriate, but not very comprehensive

*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]

3

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

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

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Please see also the comments in the paper.

-----