



Paper: “Caractérisation des adventices problématiques des vergers de l’anacardier (*Anacardium occidentale* L.) dans deux zones agroécologiques (zone soudano-guinéenne et la zone soudanienne) de Côte d’Ivoire”

Submitted: 02 June 2025

Accepted: 03 November 2025

Published: 30 November 2025

Corresponding Author: Mory Latif Konate

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n33p108

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ouattara Amidou
University of San Pedro, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Landing Ndiaye
University Assane Seck de Ziguinchor (UASZ), Sénégal

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: Landing NDIAYE	
University/Country: University Assane Seck de Ziguinchor (UASZ)/ Sénégal	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/09/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/10/2025
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation des adventices problématiques des vergers de l'anacardier (<i>Anacardium occidentale</i> L) dans deux zones agroécologiques (zone soudano-guinéenne et la zone soudanienne) de Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 44.06.2025	
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: 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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. (The title is adequate of content of this present article. For the title, I valid)	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (For the abstract I think that the author have to improved it. Methodology have to be improved)	3
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Yes, the author has to improve his grammatical production)	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly. (In this study, many things in the methods have to be reviewed. The sampling et the characterization of the adventive has to be explained clearly)	3

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(The results have to be enounced clearly and the unit of the parameters write)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(The author has to ameliorate this party)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(The references are writing clearly)</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) : The parameters (indice Shannon, indice Pielou and indice Sorensen have to be calculated for to improve this paper and the method reviewed.

For reference this authors are missing in the texte :

1. Piperno, 2011
2. Touré et al, 2016

This authors are missing in the reference

1. Firca, 2018
2. Traoré et al, 2010
3. Touré, 2010
4. Roose, 1980
5. Ipou, 2005
6. Aman, 1978

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: 27 08 25	Date Review Report Submitted: 27 08 25
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation des adventices majeures () des vergers de l'anacardier (<i>Anacardium occidentale</i> L) dans deux zones agroécologiques (lesquelles) de Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---25.---44.06.2025	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
The title is not explicit enough; specify the agroecological zones. And clarify the term 'major weeds'	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
The summary is incomplete, and the author must answer the following question! How can these results be used?	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
NO	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

<i>The material is not sufficiently exposed or does not seem appropriate for this study, which covers a very broad area. The methodology must also be supplemented in order to answer the examiner's questions.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(the results contain clarification points, the areas concerned and the impact of weeds on yields take into account the main suggestions for improving the document</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>YES</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(The references are appropriate, even if some seem too old; we suggest reviewing them.</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):

Authors must respond to concerns in order to improve the scientific quality of the manuscript.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: