

Paper: “Caracteristiques Spatio – temporales de la Variabilite Climatique au Benin (Afrique de L’ouest)”

Submitted: 31 May 2022

Accepted: 30 August 2022

Published: 30 September 2022

Corresponding Author: Inès M. Oyede

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n30p240](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n30p240)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yabi Ibouaïma
Université Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Kone Brahima
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

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: KONE Brahima	
University/Country: : Université NANGUI ABROGOUA, Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 15 Juillet 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 25 juillet 2022
Manuscript Title: INSTABILITE CLIMATIQUE SUR LES REGIMES PLUVIOMETRIQUES SAISONNIERS AU BENIN	
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: 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

<i>(The title of the article does not reflect the content of the paper. This title should only take into account the variables of precipitation and temperature Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(yes The summary presents the objectives, the methods used and the results)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(The errors are small but scientifically the sentence openings are not good)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(The exploited methodologies are not satisfactory for the highlighting of the results of this study it has to resume this part of the work.)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(the analyses do not highlight the figures too much confusion in the interpretations)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(The conclusion does not reflect the content of the work it must be applied to show the salient results.)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Some authors appear in the reference and do not present in the document it must update these references with slightly more recent works.)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):