

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

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:
Date Manuscript Received: 15-02-2019	Date Review Report Submitted: 24-02-2019
Manuscript Title: Effets des actions des PTF et échelle d'adaptation des communautés rurales aux inondations dans le doublet Karimama-Malanville(Bénin-Afrique de l'ouest).	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0144/19	
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 published version of the paper:/No	

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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
Le titre est en relation avec le contenu, bien défini	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
Le résumé est bien fait, en relation avec l'objectif, la méthodologie et les résultats	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

Des efforts à faire en technique de redaction(structure et syntaxe)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
La method de travail est clairement expliquée	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
Le développement du travail est accepté quelques erreurs d'orthographe	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
La conclusion renferme les elements essentiels. Il ya un lien avec le travail.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
La reference bibliographique a connu une amélioration	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	XXXXX
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Des efforts dans la technique de redaction; travail nettement amélioré.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

