



Paper: **“Spirulina Production in a Controlled Environment in Niger”**

Submitted: 15 May 2025

Accepted: 10 January 2026

Published: 31 January 2026

Corresponding Author: Naroua Koure Mamane Kabirou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n3p25

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Roman Jimenez-Vera

Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco, México

Reviewer 2: Sagarr A.F. Jallow

University of The Gambia

Reviewer 3: 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!

Reviewer Name: Román Jiménez Vera	
University/Country: Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco/MÉXICO	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/10/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/10/2025
Manuscript Title: Spirulina Production in Niger in a Controlled Environment	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 02.06.2025	
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. <i>The title is clear and reflects the place and conditions where the research was conducted.</i>	5
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>The summary presents all the sections to show the most important information from the research</i>	5
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>Some grammatical errors were found; a complete review of the document is suggested.</i>	3
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>The description of the methodology is adequate; however, it is recommended to reduce or properly manage the use of subtitles.</i>	4
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4

The results are clear; however, it is recommended to separate results and discussion to reduce the use of subheadings. Expanding the discussion is also important. It is recommended to improve the figures, both in size and focus.

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
---	----------

It is recommended to improve the conclusions; focus on the culture media, as well as on each of the parameters evaluated. Define the best treatment, do not just indicate it as T6.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
---	----------

The format of the references is correct; however, it is a very low number to support the research work carried out.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The research findings are highly relevant; however, improvements to the discussion of results and the conclusions are recommended. It is also important to update the references and improve the figures. Finally, the document should be formatted according to the journal's guidelines.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The research has a broad contribution to supporting sustainable community development; however, the final version of the document should be improved to eliminate errors and improve the structure of the results, discussion, conclusions, and references.