



**Paper: “Morphological Characterization of Amaranth (*Amaranthus hybridus* L.)
Accessions from Urban and Peri-Urban Market Gardening of Abidjan and
Yamoussoukro”**

Submitted: 12 September 2025

Accepted: 19 February 2026

Published: 28 February 2026

Corresponding Author: Jean-Claude N’zi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n6p123

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jay Jesus Molino
Universidad Especializada de las Américas (UDELAS), Panama

Reviewer 2: Wafaa Haggag
Plant Pathology Dept., National Research Center, Dokki, Cairo, Egypt

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 28/12/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/01/2025
Manuscript Title: Morphological characterization of amaranth (<i>Amaranthus hybridus</i> L.) accessions from urban and peri-urban market gardening in two locations of Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 60.09.2025	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes I agree	
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 I agree	

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
<i>(Please insert your comments) The title is generally clear and reflects the core focus of the study, namely the morphological characterization of <i>Amaranthus hybridus</i>. However, it could be slightly improved by specifying the study area (Abidjan and Yamoussoukro) or by explicitly mentioning the agro-morphological approach to better reflect the scope of the work.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract adequately presents the objectives, methodology, and key results of the study. Nevertheless, some sentences require linguistic refinement, and the conclusions could be more concise and explicitly linked to the main findings.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2

<i>The manuscript contains several grammatical errors, awkward expressions, and literal translations that affect readability. These issues are recurrent in the Introduction, Discussion, and Methodology sections and require thorough language editing</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The experimental design, plant material, and data analysis are generally described. However, some methodological aspects lack precision, particularly regarding sampling procedures, variable definitions, and experimental layout consistency. Clarification would strengthen reproducibility	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Results are presented with appropriate tables and statistical analyses. However, there are minor inconsistencies in terminology (quantitative vs. qualitative traits) and interpretation of coefficients of variation and correlations, which should be clarified to avoid misinterpretation.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions are generally supported by the results and highlight the importance of morphological variability for breeding purposes. Nonetheless, some statements could be toned down to avoid overinterpretation, especially regarding genetic implications inferred from morphological data.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are relevant and appropriately cited, covering both regional and international studies. Some citations are slightly outdated, and consistency in citation formatting should be improved. Including more recent literature could further strengthen the manuscript</i>	

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):

✓ Provide more details on:

Total number of plants observed

Sampling method

Scientific justification for site selection

Cultural practices (irrigation, fertilization)

Weak statistical analysis

Statistical methods are poorly described

Some results are presented without statistical tests

No indication of the software used

✓ Specify clearly:

Statistical tests applied (ANOVA, PCA, Student's t-test, etc.)

Level of significance ($p < 0.05$)

Software used (R, SPSS, XLSTAT, etc.)

Results and interpretation

Descriptive results with limited interpretation

Tables are informative but:

Titles are incomplete

Units are sometimes missing

Figures are poorly discussed in the text

Interpretations are sometimes speculative

✓ Each table and figure should:

Be cited in the text

Be biologically interpreted

Be clearly linked to the initial objectives of the study

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!

Reviewer Name: Jay Molino	
University/Country: Panama	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/Dec/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/Dec/2025
Manuscript Title: Morphological characterization of amaranth (<i>Amaranthus hybridus</i> L.) accessions from urban and peri-urban market gardening in two locations of Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0960/25	
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 is clear, precise, and accurately reflects the scope, objectives, and content of the manuscript. It correctly indicates the species studied, the nature of the work (morphological characterization), and the geographical context. While not particularly innovative or catchy, it is technically appropriate and honest, which is suitable for a scientific characterization study.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
The abstract clearly states the objective, experimental design, variables analyzed, and main findings. The results are summarized in a coherent manner, highlighting the observed variability and the superior performance of the green morphotype. However, the abstract could	

be slightly strengthened by explicitly mentioning the use of multivariate analyses (PCA) to better reflect the analytical depth of the study.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
The manuscript contains several grammatical inaccuracies, minor spelling issues, and stylistic inconsistencies. These errors do not prevent understanding of the scientific content but require careful language revision to improve readability and clarity. Proofreading is recommended as part of the revision process.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The experimental design, plant material, site description, cultural practices, and data collection procedures are described clearly and in sufficient detail. The use of IPGRI descriptors and standard statistical analyses is appropriate. However, additional clarification is recommended regarding the coding and treatment of qualitative variables used in correlation and PCA analyses.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The results are generally well presented, with comprehensive tables and appropriate statistical analyses. Nevertheless, minor inconsistencies were identified, particularly concerning the reported coefficients of variation and their interpretation. Additionally, very high correlation coefficients involving qualitative variables should be interpreted with caution and better methodological justification should be provided.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions are consistent with the results presented and are adequately supported by the data. The identification of promising accessions and the emphasis on the green morphotype are logically derived from the findings. The conclusions remain within the scope of the study and do not overstate the implications.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The reference list is appropriate and relevant to the subject matter, with good coverage of regional and international literature on amaranth and leafy vegetables. The citations adequately support the discussion. Some references are relatively old, but this is acceptable given the descriptive and baseline nature of the study.	

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):

This manuscript presents a scientifically valid and methodologically sound morphological characterization of *Amaranthus hybridus* accessions from Côte d’Ivoire. The experimental design is appropriate, the data are extensive, and the discussion is well grounded in relevant literature.

To further strengthen the manuscript, the authors are encouraged to:

- Clarify the treatment and numerical coding of qualitative variables, particularly those included in correlation analyses and PCA.

- Review and correct minor inconsistencies in the reporting and interpretation of coefficients of variation.
- Adopt a more cautious interpretation of very high correlation coefficients involving qualitative traits.
- Improve the overall language quality through careful grammatical and stylistic revision.

Addressing these points will enhance the clarity and rigor of the manuscript without altering its core scientific contribution.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The manuscript is technically sound and aligns well with the scope of ESJ, which emphasizes scientific validity and technical quality rather than perceived impact. The study is descriptive and confirmatory in nature, but provides valuable baseline data for underrepresented regions. The issues identified are minor and correctable, and do not compromise the overall validity of the work.