



Paper: “Performances Des « Fermes Modèles » Du Corridor De Monkoto Dans La Province De La Tshuapa, République Démocratique Du Congo”

Corresponding Author: Papy Bonkena

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n24p206

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: KOUAME Konan, Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo (Côte d’Ivoire)

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Gnangenon-Guesseè Denis, Université de Abomey-Calavi (UAC) Benin

Published: 31.08.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: KOUAME Konan	Email:
University/Country: Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 06/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Performances des « fermes modèles » du corridor de Monkoto dans la province de la Tshuapa, République Démocratique du Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0739/20	
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.	4
<i>(The title is clearly and adequate to the content of the article)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(The abstract is acceptable but it don't present the objects, the methodology and a</i>	

<i>small conclusion)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(There are fewer grammar and vocabulary mistakes)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(The study methods are clearly explained)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3.5
<i>(The paper contains all the different parts and contains few errors)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(The conclusion are accurate and supported by the content)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(The references are comprehensive and are clearly written)</i>	

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):

Author must take into account these observations to improve the document

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/07/2020
Manuscript Title: Performances des « fermes modèles » du corridor de Monkoto dans la province de la Tshuapa, République Démocratique du Congo / Performances of « model farms » in the Monkoto corridor in the province of Tshuapa, Democratic Republic of Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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: 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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Sample size requires justification). La taille de l'échantillon mérite une justification.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Figures require a few details for improving understanding). Les figures ont besoin de quelques détails pour faciliter la compréhension ;</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Although comprehensive and appropriate, the list is not well presented: citations in the text are missing from the list and vice versa and the form of presentation is not uniform). Les références sont complètes et appropriées mais la liste est mal présentée : des citations dans le texte manquent dans la liste et vice versa et la forme de présentation n'est pas uniforme</i>	

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):

Evaluation du Manuscrit

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: Gnangenon-Guesseè Denis	Email:
University/Country: Université de Abomey-Calavi (UAC) BENIN	
Date Manuscript Received: 14/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/07/2020
Manuscript Title: Performances des « fermes modèles » du corridor de Monkotodans la province de la Tshuapa, République Démocratique du Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 39.07.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oui	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oui	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oui	

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
Le titre est clair et adapté au contenu de l'article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

Le résumé présente très bien les objectifs (général et spécifique) avec une méthodologie claire et très compréhensible. Les résultats sont bien décrits.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
Il n'y a pas d'erreurs grammaticales et d'orthographe dans cet article. Il y a lieu de vérifier l'écriture des auteurs cités dans le texte	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Les méthodes d'étude sont bien expliquées et bien compréhensibles	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
Le corps du document est clair et bien lisible. Il ne contient pas d'erreur	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Il est nécessaire de mentionner la date de démarrage de ces fermes modèles. Ce qui permettra au lecteur d'évaluer la durée d'expérimentation des fermes modèles et la pertinence de l'étude, des résultats et des conclusions.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Vallset <i>al.</i> , 2011, Ruschawet <i>al.</i> , 2014, Vincent, 2016), Fabre (1994), Nyemeck et al. (2003, FAO (2001), Ces auteurs n'apparaissent pas dans les références.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, minor revision needed	4,5
---------------------------------	------------

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- a) Il y a lieu de vérifier l'orthographe des auteurs : Ruschawet *al.*, 2014 dans le document.
- b) Vallset *al.*, 2011, Ruschawet *al.*, 2014, Vincent, 2016), Fabre (1994), Nyemeck et al. (2003, FAO (2001), Ces auteurs n'apparaissent dans les références. Il y a lieu de corriger la bibliographie.
- c) Il est important et nécessaire de mentionner la date de démarrage de ces fermes modèles. Ce qui nous permettra d'évaluer la durée d'expérimentation des fermes modèles et la pertinence de l'étude, des résultats et des conclusions.
- d) Il est important de localiser la position de la zone d'étude dans une carte qui situe le lecteur au niveau de la RDC (Congo) et en Afrique.