



Paper: “Etude diagnostique de la fertilisation du concombre à San Pedro au Sud-Ouest de la Côte d’Ivoire”

Submitted: 25 February 2025

Accepted: 19 May 2025

Published: 31 May 2025

Corresponding Author: Victorine Ouattara

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n15p71

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Amadou Faye Diedhiou
Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor, Sénégal

Reviewer 2: Haoua Bori
INRAN, Niamey, Niger

Reviewer 3: Coulibaly Noupé Diakaria
Centre National de Recherche Agronomique (CNRA), Côte d’Ivoire

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: 04 02 2025	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Combinaison des engrais organiques et chimiques : impact sur le rendement référentiel du concombre à San Pedro, Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---05.---24.03.2025---	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No	
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. <i>Il faut revoir le titre du document la différence entre impact et effet</i>	3
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>(il faudra bien détailler la méthodologie et la présentation des résultats)</i>	3
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>(il faut plus de détail par rapport à la méthode sur le suivi l'expérimentation aussi)</i>	3
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(revoir tes references car il ya des auteurs qui ne figure pas dans les references)</i>	

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):

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:	
University/Country: INRAN/Niamey/Niger	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
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.

<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>Revoir le titre pour qu'on sent que c'est une étude socio</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>Bien décrire la méthode et revoir la partie résultat</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>La méthodologie est à revoir</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Les interprétations des résultats doivent être développées et claires</i>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>RAS</i>	

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):

Je vous suggère de discuter plus vos résultats

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: COULIBALY Noupé Diakaria	
University/Country: Centre National de Recherche Agronomique (CNRA) / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 2025 /03 / 14	Date Review Report Submitted: 2025 / 03 / 29
Manuscript Title: Combinaison des engrais organiques et chimiques : impact sur le rendement référentiel du concombre à San Pedro, Côte d'Ivoire.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 05/2403/2025	
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. <i>See the comments in the manuscript</i>	2
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>See the comments in the manuscript</i>	3
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>See the comments in the manuscript</i>	3
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>See the comments in the manuscript</i>	2,5

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>See the comments in the manuscript</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>See the comments in the manuscript</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

**I recommend the authors to take into account all the comments and corrections made.
The manuscript need to be revise seriously.**