

Manuscript: “**Agromorphological Evaluation of 44 lines of Mung Bean (*Vigna radiata* (L.) Wilczek) Introduced in Burkina Faso**”

Submitted: 18 August 2021

Accepted: 15 October 2021

Published: 30 November 2021

Corresponding Author: W. M.Serge Felicien Zida

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n40p20

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Zagre M’bi Bertin, Université Aube nouvelle/ Ouagadougou

Reviewer 2: Prof. Dr. Amal Talib Al Sa'ady, College of Pharmacy/University of Babylon, Iraq.

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!

Reviewer Name: ZAGRE M'BI BERTIN	
University/Country: Université Aube nouvelle/ Ouagadougou	
Date Manuscript Received: 8/9/2021	Date Review Report Submitted : 12/9/2021
Manuscript Title: Agromorphological characterization and evaluation of 44 lines of Mung Bean (<i>Vigna radiata</i> (L.) Wilczek) introduced in Burkina Faso	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 11.09.2021	
You agree 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/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

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
Instead of Agromorphological characterization and evaluation of 44 lines of Mung Bean (<i>Vigna radiata</i> (L.) Wilczek) introduced in Burkina Faso, the title can be “Agromorphological evaluation of 44 lines of Mung Bean (<i>Vigna radiata</i> (L.) Wilczek) introduced in Burkina Faso” or “Agromorphological characterization of 44 lines of Mung Bean (<i>Vigna radiata</i> (L.) Wilczek) introduced in Burkina Faso”	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results but the author does not specify the period of study and the place	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
In this regard the author has made a considerable effort because we note a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
In terms of the characters measured, the author should have indicated when? How and on which unit were the measurements taken?	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are clearly presented, supported by figures and tables.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusion goes well with the content of the article and the previously defined objective	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Bibliographic references not only meet the standards but contain recent articles. We however note, , that there are authors in the text who are not listed in the reference and authors in the reference who are not cited in the text. We also note an inversion of the alphabetical order of the authors in reference	

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):

At the end of this evaluation, here are the comments and suggestions offered to the authors in order to improve the text. Minor corrections have been made in the text:

- We offer them the following title: “Agromorphological evaluation of 44 lines of Mung Bean (*Vigna radiata* (L.) Wilczek) introduced in Burkina Faso” or “Agromorphological characterization of 44 lines of Mung Bean (*Vigna radiata* (L.) Wilczek) introduced in Burkina Faso”.
- The summary is missing the study period and the site.
- Why did you compare your 44 lines of mung bean to a variety of cowpea? Isn't there a reference mung bean variety to do this?
- Harmonize the writing of mung bean either in one word or in two.
- In Table 1, review the size and font.
- In the material and methods part, write a paragraph on the experimental site, another on the plant material, another on the traits measured and finally another on data collection and analysis of variance.
- For the characters measured, you don't say when and how the measurements were made and in what unit.
- We can add to table 4 the degree of significance given in table 5 and delete Table 5.
- Harmonize the writing of et al followed by the year in parentheses or not.
- In the text there are 12 cited authors who do not appear in the reference. They are underlined in the text.
- The author's numbers 7, 8, 13, 30 and 32 in reference are not cited in the text.
- Author's number 25 is incomplete because the number of pages is missing
- In the first paragraph of the eighth line of the discussion on Heritability and genetic advance, we have Venkateswarlu, (2001b). Where is Venkateswarlu, (2001a). In reference to number 34 we have only Venkateswarlu, (2001). In the second paragraph of the third line of the discussion on Heritability and genetic advance, we have Bisht et al., (1998). In the fifth paragraph of the same part we also have Bisht et al. (1998). The year of reference number 2 can be 1998a and number 3, 1998b

