

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form*

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.

***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: KOFFI Kouamé Kevin	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 11/10/2018	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/10/2018
Manuscript Title: Influence du mode d'association culturale maïs [ <i>zea mays</i> (l.) (poaceae)] - niébé [ <i>vigna unguiculata</i> (l.) walp (fabaceae)] sur la masse et la qualité nutritionnelle des semences	
ESJ Manuscript Number: -52.10.2018	
You agree your name to be revealed to the author of the paper: yes	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
No; title is restrictive, it not take account pure culture of both species.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Yes but some corrections have been done in the manuscript</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>level of language is good</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
Methodology presents a weakness more for vegetal material (see comment in manuscript)	
<b>5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
yes	
<b>6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
Some authors cited in reference are not in the text body (example <b>Vanlauwe B., Diels J. &amp; Keatinge J.D.H. (2003)</b> . Amélioration de la gestion des sols par l'introduction de légumineuses dans les systèmes céréaliers des savanes africaines. <i>Cahiers Agriculture</i> 12, 227-233.  <b>Caviglia O.P., Sadras V.O. &amp; Andrade F.H. (2011)</b> . Yield and Quality of Wheat and Soybean in Sole- and Double-Cropping. <i>Agronomy Journal</i> 103: 1081-1089.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>x</b>
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

(Please summarize your opinion and suggestions)

Manuscript needs major revision concerning material and method (more information must be done on variety of species use in this study.

Discussion must improved

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**European Scientific Journal**  
European Scientific Institute

