

Paper: “Activites Agricoles et Developpement Local dans la Commune d’Athieme au Sud-Ouest du Benin”

Submitted: 27 December 2021

Accepted: 18 April 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Roméo Kadjegbin

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n13p103](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n13p103)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Adjakpa Tchékpo Théodore
University of Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Benin

Reviewer 2: 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 ADJAKPA Tchékpo Théodore	Name:	
University/Country: University of Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Benin		
Date Manuscript Received: 04 january 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: January 11, 2022	
Manuscript Title: ACTIVITES AGRICOLES ET DEVELOPPEMENT LOCALE DANS LA COMMUNE D'ATHIEME AU SUD-OUEST DU BENIN		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0121/22"		
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: : 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>(1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract is clear. But some precision must be brought</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article which must be corrected.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Yes, the study methods used are cleared</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Yes the results are clear but it contains some errors which are related in the manuscript and needed to be corrected.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes the conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. But its contains some errors which must be corrected</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate but some authors are been omitted and it needed to be corrected as indicate by the corrector</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The bibliographies' references of this article must to be completed by some the authors which are been omitted.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: