

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:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Consentement à payer et rentabilité d'une innovation en agro-alimentaire : cas du décorticage mécanique et de la fortification en fer du sorgho dans le NordBénin	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

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>	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The title is somewhat acceptable, but there are two components in the study the WTP and the financial profitability	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> Include clearly the context, the methods and the policy implication. There is room to extend the abstract.	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> It is advised to elaborate on some sections of the project (see reviewed manuscript in attachment)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The methods section should be further elaborated and consolidated my existing references on the methods, including the justification of the choice made by authors.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2

<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> Reworking are needed as per the review comments in the attached file. Especially the authors should come up with stronger discussion of the results	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The policy recommendation should emerge clearly from a consistent discussion.	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. <i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> More references are needed to support the manuscripts, especially the introduction, the methods and the discussion.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article deals with an interesting subject, but the theoretical foundations are lacking. The authors are also advised to demonstrate the practical value of the article so that they can easily come up at the end with workable policy recommendations.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

It is advised that author rework the manuscript and submit it as per the comments.

