

Paper: “Analyse de Quelques Caractéristiques de la Filière Maraichage dans Trois Provinces du Gabon”

Submitted: 01 August 2022

Accepted: 19 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Claude Gnacadja

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p296](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p296)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Kouame Konan

Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 15/04/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/04/2020
Manuscript Title: ELEVAGE URBAIN : UN MODE DE VIE DANS LES VILLES MOYENNES DE L'OUEST-CAMEROUN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 39.04.2020(1)	
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: 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.	4
<i>(The content is consistent with the title however this is very poorly illustrated)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(the different parts do not stand out clearly in the abstract)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

<i>(There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article, however, in places, there are badly constructed sentences which do not facilitate understanding.)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>(The methodology as presented in this work stop up the reader's understanding.)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(In this article, the results chapter is confused with that of the discussion. You will notice that the document does not have the title discussion.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(The summary seems to be the best presented part in this document but the conclusion even less.)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(The bibliographic references do not respect the instructions of the newspaper and are poor. there are not enough newspaper articles and the majority of the bibliography is linked to websites. Some citations are in the text but not in the list of references while others present in the list of references are not found in the text.)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The subject that the author tried to present article is quite interesting, however the writing of this document was done without taking it seriously. However, these observations which have been made are aimed at improving the quality of the document which will certainly be useful for the scientific world.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

To you ESJ, I would like to say thank you for your support to young researchers in the publication of their work. However, I would like to draw your attention to one fact. Young researchers no longer want to make an effort, just by counting on ESJ for the publication of their poorly written work in record time.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Prof. KOUAKOU Kouakou Paul-Alfred	Email: drkouakou@rocketmail.com
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Analyse de quelques caractéristiques de la filière maraichage dans trois provinces du Gabon	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre est clair et adapté au contenu de l'article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>Le résumé est bon, excepté quelques problèmes de rédaction.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Moins de coquilles. Le document est bien rédigé.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Acceptable. Pour améliorer la qualité du document, il fallait intégrer les outils statistiques ou économétriques.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Beaucoup de résultats. Acceptable.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Une belle conclusion.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Il faut utiliser des sources récentes, moins de 5 ans.</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):

Prenez en compte ces critiques pour améliorer la qualité de ce document.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Cet article peut être publié si l'auteur prend en compte les critiques.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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	
University/Country: Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 19/08/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Analyse de quelques caractéristiques de la filière maraichage dans trois provinces du Gabon	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0825/22	
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.	2.5
<i>(The title is not very clearly and adequate to the content of the article)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3.5

<i>(The abstract is clearly presents objects and methods)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3.5
<i>(There are many grammar and vocabulary mistakes)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(The study methods are not very clearly explained)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(The results are clear and not contain 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.	2.5
<i>(The references are not comprehensive and not appropriate)</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:

I thank you for putting me among your reviewers