
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: March 29 th , 2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: April 11 th 2018
Manuscript Title: Connaissances paysannes et prédisposition à adopter une innovation en agro-alimentaire : cas du décorticage mécanique et de la fortification en fer du sorgho dans le Nord-Bénin.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0431/18	

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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The title fits quite well the content of the paper	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The abstract currently lacks methodology sections which should be completed and results from the statistical analyses	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Thorough correction of the paper for errors checking and double checking.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> Yes. However, there is a need to split materials into data collection and data analysis	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> It contains some errors that need to be fixed.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> Yes but reshape is needed	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	4
<i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i> Some need to be double checked	
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	

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):

This paper has the benefit to assess Farmers' knowledge and predisposition to adopt an innovation in agribusiness: the case of mechanical dehulling and the iron fortification of sorghum in North Benin. Even of a recurrent importance there are some errors that need to be fixe to improve the scientific quality of the manuscript. See file attached

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

