



Paper: “Co-évolution des paysages urbain et agricole à Ouidah (Sud-ouest du Bénin) : entre urbanisation et déprise agricole”

Corresponding Author: Isidore Yolou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n14p143

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Baloubi M. David
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Reviewer 2: Assouni Janvier
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Reviewer 3: Paulin Ouoba
Université Nazi Boni, Burkina Faso

Published: 31.05.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: 25/03/2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Co-évolution des paysages urbain et agricole à Ouidah (Sud-ouest du Bénin) : entre urbanisation et déprise agricole	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 20.04.2020	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments) The method in the abstract is not clear</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes can be find in the text; please see my comments in the text. Particularly the writing style in the introduction must be revised.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Some aspects of methodology have to be explained clearly: see my comments in the article text.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Many mistakes: for the figures the titles are not in appropriate places. Some grammatical mistakes and some Scientific words must be explained. See my comments in the text.	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: The French language must be checked before publication.