

Paper: “Acteurs dans le Processus de Diffusion et d’Adoption des Variétés Améliorées d’Avocats dans le Département du Bamboutos (Cameroun)”

Submitted: 11 January 2023

Accepted: 29 May 2023

Published: 31 May 2023

Corresponding Author: Mitterand Telesphore Fopa

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n15p209](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n15p209)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yaya Dosso

Université Alassane Ouattara, Bouaké, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Hippolite Azaou

Université de Dschang, Bafoussam, Cameroun

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 27 mars 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 05 avril 2023
Manuscript Title: Acteurs de diffusion et d'adoption des variétés améliorées d'avocats dans le département du Bamboutos (Cameroun)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0151/23	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre est clair et en adéquation avec le contenu de l'article. On pourrait ajouté Ouest à Cameroun pour mieux localizer Bamboutos	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Le résumé présente, l'objectif de la recherche, la methodologie et les résultats. Seulement, il est très long avec un style parfois lourd et mérite d'être relu en profondeur pour le render plus digeste. De plus, il serait bon de découlé d'un contexte.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Certes, les fautes de grammaire sont mineures mais le style est dans l'ensemble lourd et plus grave dans le résumé. Ce qui n'accroche pas le lecteur.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
La methodologie de recherché utilisée est indiquée meme si a des endroits, elle n'est pas explicite. Les techniques de collecte et de traitement des données indiquées devraient aboutir a des analyses statistiques descriptives et meme de fréquence. Mais dans le travail on reste sur sa faim.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les résultats de l'étude ne sont pas clairement présentés. On trouve dans le texte des statistiques sans les voir découlé d'un tablau ou d'une figure. 115 acteurs ont été enquetés mais le travail à un seul tableau et une figure. Pour le cas de la figure le lecteur n'est pas éclairé sur les variations de la taille des fleches représentées.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
La conclusion est correcte. Seulement, elle ne debouche pas sur des perspectives	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Dans les references, on ne fait pas aisement la difference entre les articles et les ouvrages. De plus, la presentation n'est pas uniforme. Relire les consignes aux auteurs sur la presentation de la bibliographie puis choisir le modele de presentation et le respecté.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	--------------------------

Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Le sujet est intéressant au regard non seulement de la place importante qu'occupe ce produit mais surtout de l'engouement autour de l'utilisation des variétés améliorées. Le résumé manque de contexte permettant de mieux comprendre l'adoption et la diffusion des VAA. La méthodologie indique de bonne technique de collecte des données qui devrait déboucher sur des analyses statistiques descriptives et même de fréquence. Malheureusement on reste dans la soif devant l'absence des résultats annoncés qui devaient être mieux présentés dans des tableaux et/ou des figures. C'est certainement ce qui justifie la longueur du texte qui, associé au style souvent lourd n'accroche pas le lecteur. Enfin la précision et la concision sont exigées pour réduire au maximum le nombre de page.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Acteurs de diffusion et d'adoption des variétés améliorées d'avocats dans le département du Bamboutos (Cameroun)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>The text should be proofread by the author(s) to correct mistakes. There are too many shortcomings in the syntax.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>In the introduction-problem, there is a lot of crucial information without sources. This is not acceptable in social science.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results are quite acceptable. However, they contain too many syntax errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>It is true that Cameroon is not part of CAMES, but we encourage authors to use bibliographic references, indicating all the necessary elements and differentiating between the types of documents. The CAMES norms may help them.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

We ask the authors to proofread the entire text and correct the many mistakes that devalue the work. Also, we invite them to put the sources of the imported capital information. Furthermore, they should take into account the remarks made in the document. In addition, the author must organize his work into parts:

- 1.
- 1.1
- 1.2. etc

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Thank you very much for your confidence.