

Manuscript: “**Etude de la Performance Economique de la Replantation Annuelle De Bananiers Plantain, Une Strategie De Gestion des Nematodes au Sud de la Cote D’ivoire**”

Submitted: 23 June 2021

Accepted: 09 August 2021

Published: 31 August 2021

Corresponding Author: Otro Serge Theodore Vawai

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p55

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Saraka Allou Isidore, Laboratoire de Botanique, UFR Biosciences, Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 25/06/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Etude de la performance économique de la culture replantée de bananier plantain au Sud de la Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0724/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No	
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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [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)</i> Well-informed title of the content	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	3

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Conforms to the organisation of a scientific summary, but just lacks a small conclusion to draw at the end	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
There are some grammatical errors in the document that I have noted. The authors should take into account the suggestions for improving the manuscript	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The methodology lacks some clarity.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The results are well presented overall	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The conclusion reflects the content of the manuscript	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Bibliographic references should be updated with more recent data (less than 5 years)	

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):

Cette étude est très importante pour celui qui veut entreprendre la culture de la banana plantain en culture de contre saison. Au niveau de la méthodologie adoptée, vous devez faire ressortir les prix unitaires de tous les intrants de sorte que la presentation des résultats soit plus aisée. Le constat est que vous êtes obliges à chaque de rappeler les unitaires dans vos résultats. La discussion dans son ensemble n'est pas bien fournie.

Vous vous plus étalés sur la presentation de vos résultats dans la discussion. Essayer de lire des articles sur les études socio-économiques et répondez votre discussion. Quant aux références bibliographiques, ils ne sont pas trop fournies et ne sont pas aussi récentes. Veuillez faire recours à des références de moins 5 ans de préférences.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 2021-06-26	Date Review Report Submitted: 2021-07-01
Manuscript Title: ETUDE DE LA PERFORMANCE ECONOMIQUE DE LA CULTURE REPLANTEE DE BANANIER PLANTAIN AU SUD DE LA COTE D'IVOIRE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0724/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: 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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The objects are not clearly defined, the results are partially presented with errors, the economic performance of the replanted crop is not clearly presented in the abstract. The announced gross profit margin does not appear in the results of the article (see my comment in the article)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study methods are clearly explained</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Some results are clear but others contain errors and are confusing in this article</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusion and the summary do not exactly reflect the content of this article (See my comments in side)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Review the structure of the summary and pay attention to the numbers. Make simple and understandable sentences. Review the formulation of the problematic. Clearly define the objective of the work, specify the research questions and finally make sure that the results of each experiment answer the specific questions. Review the calculations, or better yet, do them on Excel to avoid errors. Review the discussion. Take into account the different comments in the margin.