

---

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review report. 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 review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend 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: 30.01.18	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 11.02.18
Manuscript Title: <b>Analyse de l'efficacité technique des exploitations agricoles familiales à Maurice : une application de la méthode Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA).</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: -119.01.2018.	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>See my comments in the manuscript attached.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>See my comments in the manuscript attached.</i>	
<b>3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>See my comments in the manuscript attached.</i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(An explanation is recommendable) See my comments in the manuscript attached.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(An explanation is recommendable) See my comments in the manuscript attached.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(An explanation is recommendable) See my comments in the manuscript attached.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)  (a brief explanation is recommendable) See my comments in the manuscript attached.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

*Voir mes commentaires sur cette partie dan l'article*

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**Please kindly accept the article after inclusion of the minor corrections and also my**

**comments. The author needs to clearly specify what are the research questions and hypotheses of their research. Also, part of the discussion is short and should be extended and match with the content of the results presented.**

