

Paper: “La Radio Communautaire Damergou et la Promotion des Bonnes Pratiques Agricoles Face au Changement Climatique dans la Commune Urbaine de Tanout (Zinder/Niger)”

Submitted: 22 December 2021

Accepted: 21 April 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Kouassi Agbo Sô

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n13p123](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n13p123)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Koffi Ahébé Marie Hélène
Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé, Côte d’Ivoire

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 Name: KOFFI Ahébé Marie Héléne	
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé/Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 01/02/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/02/2022
Manuscript Title: La radio communautaire <i>Damergou</i> et la promotion des bonnes pratiques agricoles face au changement climatique dans la commune urbaine de Tanout (zinder/niger).	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0115/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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
<i>Le titre est clairement élaboré</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Le résumé est compréhensible</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>L'auteur doit corriger certaines fautes de grammaire et d'orthographe</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>La méthodologie n'est pas explicite, elle est trop brève et ne concorde pas avec le contenu des résultats</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Les résultats ont été bien expliqués</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>La conclusion est à refaire</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>La référence est à revoir</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: