



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Etude d’adaptation de cinq variétés de concombre (*Cucumis sativus* L.) sous différentes doses de fiente de poules dans les conditions agroécologiques de Kinshasa Ngaliema”

Submitted: 16 July 2026

Accepted: 18 September 2026

Published: 30 September 2026

Corresponding Author: Muliele Muku Tony

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n27p224

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hien Victorine Epouse Ouattara
Polytechnic University of San Pedro, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Anguessin Benjamine
Université de Maroua, Cameroun

Reviewer 3: Kouame Djaha
Université Jean Lorougnon Guede, Côte d'Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: HIEN Victorine Epouse OUATTARA	
University, Country: Polytechnic University of San Pedro, Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Adaptation study of five cucumber varieties (<i>Cucumis sativus</i> L.) under different doses of poultry manure in the agroecological conditions of Kinshasa Ngaliema	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree that 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 for the content of the article.	3
<i>(The title is too long and should be shortened. In addition, "poultry manure" should be used instead of "poultry droppings," as it more accurately describes the organic amendment used, which includes bedding materials such as wood shavings and rice straw.)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	3
<i>(The author should revise the statistical analysis and ensure that the statistical tests used are appropriate for the experimental design and the data)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(The manuscript requires language revision. Several sentences are too long, and some grammatical, spelling, and syntactic errors should be corrected to improve clarity and readability.)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(The methodology is generally described, but some aspects require further clarification. The statistical analysis should be reviewed and better justified to ensure that the methods are appropriate for the experimental design and the data collected. More methodological details would improve the reproducibility of the study.)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(The results are generally clear; however, some inconsistencies should be corrected. The statistical analysis should be reviewed to ensure the validity of the results and the comparisons made. A more rigorous presentation of the results would improve their clarity and interpretation.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(A few corrections are needed)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(The references need to be corrected)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	The manuscript is accepted, subject to the required corrections
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please make the necessary corrections, taking into account the reviewers' comments

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No additional comments

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: ANGUESSIN Benjamine	
University, Country: Université de Maroua, Cameroun	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/07/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 03/08/2026
Manuscript Title: Etude d'adaptation de cinq variétés de concombre (<i>Cucumis sativus</i> L.) sous différentes doses de fiente de poules dans les conditions agroécologiques de Kinshasa Ngaliema	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0807/26	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Je ne vois pas l'intérêt de le faire	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper is available in the "review history" of the paper: Je ne vois pas l'intérêt de le faire	

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 for the content of the article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre n'est pas en adéquation avec le contenu de l'article. La notion d'« adaptation » évoquée dans le titre ne ressort pas dans le travail; je propose comme titre : « Effets des fertilisants organiques à base des fientes de poules sur les différentes variétés de concombre (<i>Cucumis sativus</i> L.) dans les conditions agroécologiques de Kinshasa Ngaliema »	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les objectifs ne sont pas bien énoncés dans le résumé.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le style grammatical est clair.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthode est bien expliquée mais elle manque de références. Justifiez le choix de votre méthode en insérant les noms des auteurs (littérature).	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats sont clairs	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Certaines déclarations au niveau de la conclusion n'ont pas été traitées dans le travail	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Enrichir votre bibliographie avec des références récentes	

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):

Je suggère aux auteurs de prendre en compte les différentes remarques faites afin d'améliorer la qualité de leur travail.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: KOUAME DJAHA	Email: kouamedjaha1900@gmail.com
University, Country: Université Jean LOROUGNON GUEDE	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/07/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/08/2026
Manuscript Title: Etude d'adaptation de cinq variétés de concombre (<i>Cucumis sativus</i> L.) sous différentes doses de fiente de poules dans les conditions agroécologiques de Kinshasa Ngaliema	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0807/26	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES / NO	
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 for the content of the article.	4
Le titre est bon mais nous avons apporté une légère modification qui se trouve dans l'article instruit.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
Le résumé est bien présenté, quelques légers apports ont été mis dans le texte. Toutes les rubriques y sont comprises.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Il n'y a pratiquement pas d'erreurs grammaticales et d'orthographe.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
La méthodologie est clairement expliquée et adaptée, il reste à y ajouter une carte du site d'étude.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Les résultats sont assez clairs et répondent à la méthodologie appliquée.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4.5
La conclusion et le résumé relatent les grandes lignes de travail et sont en adéquation avec le contenu du document	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4.5
Les références sont assez compréhensibles et appropriées	

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):

Le titre doit être circonscrit, nous avons ajouté le nom du pays où se déroule le travail et enlevé le thème “étude dans le début de votre titre. Aussi nous avons suggéré d’écrire “fiente de poulets” en lieu et place de “fiente de poules”

Le document dans sa globalité est assez bien écrit. Les suggestions et observations sont dans le document.