



Paper: “Elevage Urbain : Pratiques Quotidiennes dans les Villes Moyennes de L’ouest-Cameroun”

Corresponding Author: Amelie Djeugap

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n17p115

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Dimbo Ndama
Jean Baptiste Université de Douala, Cameroun

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Tabou Talahatou
University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Published: 30.06.2020

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: 26/04/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/05/2020
Manuscript Title: ELEVAGE URBAIN : UN MODE DE VIE DANS LES VILLES MOYENNES DE L' OUEST-CAMEROUN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 01	
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: No	
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>The title is not well formulated and it is not adapted to the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>It is clearly presented despite some questionable points</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes, but sometimes there are inconsistencies in the arrangement of ideas.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The study methods are not explained clearly and are imperfect.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>The body of the paper is not clear. It does not follow the order of presentation of an article in IMRAD and the plan is not very relevant with certain titles that are not very evocative. There are a lot of claims without demonstration.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>There is not partial conclusion or transition between different parts of the body of the text.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>There is some interesting references, but some sources are not indicated in the text.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The title of this article poses a problem of understanding because the work is mainly interested in urban breeding and the daily practices of breeders. We reasonably think that practicing an activity or integrating it into medium or long-term strategies does not make it a way of life even if the life of certain actors is more or less punctuated by the related practices.

The methodology is briefly described with imprecise or missing information. The

work is mainly based on qualitative data while the author refers to quantitative data in his analysis. This clearly shows that this work cannot avoid the need for appropriate stastic surveys and quantified data to show the importance of the phenomenon studied. Moreover, bibliographic research was not mentioned in the methodology, but the author refers to several other works by authors in his work.

The results are presented in an unsuitable plan with analyzes that are not very rigorous at certain points. The study data are inconsistent and raise many questions (see comments in the text). In addition, the discussion which was to constitute the 4th part in the structuring of an article in IMRAD was integrated into the last part of the results. It mentions certain results noted in previous work but which were not developed or were simply listed in the results of this study. Likewise, the conclusion includes several general observations that were not addressed in the work.

Finally, the author would benefit from directly exploiting and / or integrating in the text the content of the framed texts. These framed texts refer to interviews with various actors who engage in this breeding activity. It would have been interesting to make a typology of these actors and their proportion in the population of breeders and the urban population.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: 15/04/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/04/2020
Manuscript Title: ELEVAGE URBAIN : UN MODE DE VIE DANS LES VILLES MOYENNES DE L'OUEST-CAMEROUN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 39.04.2020(1)	
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: No	
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.	4
<i>(The content is consistent with the title however this is very poorly illustrated)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(the different parts do not stand out clearly in the abstract)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

<i>(There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article, however, in places, there are badly constructed sentences which do not facilitate understanding.)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>(The methodology as presented in this work stop up the reader's understanding.)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(In this article, the results chapter is confused with that of the discussion. You will notice that the document does not have the title discussion.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(The summary seems to be the best presented part in this document but the conclusion even less.)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(The bibliographic references do not respect the instructions of the newspaper and are poor. there are not enough newspaper articles and the majority of the bibliography is linked to websites. Some citations are in the text but not in the list of references while others present in the list of references are not found in the text.)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The subject that the author tried to present article is quite interesting, however the writing of this document was done without taking it seriously. However, these observations which have been made are aimed at improving the quality of the document which will certainly be useful for the scientific world.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



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: 30 avril 2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Élevage urbain : un mode de vie dans les villes moyennes de l'ouest-Cameroun	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
Vous acceptez que votre nom soit révélé à l'auteur de l'article: Non	
Vous approuvez, votre nom en tant que réviseur de ce document est disponible dans l'«historique des révisions» du document : Oui	
Vous approuvez, ce rapport d'examen est disponible dans l'«historique d'examen» du document : Oui	

Evaluation Criteria:

Veillez attribuer à chaque élément d'évaluation une note numérique sur une échelle de 5 points, ainsi qu'une explication approfondie de chaque note numérique.

<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> Le thème proposé par les auteurs est : Élevage urbain : un mode de vie dans les villes moyennes de l'ouest-Cameroun. Le champ sémantique de la notion de mode de vie renvoie au standing, au confort, comme si cela relevait d'une option. Or, l'élevage est une activité de la culture des hautes terres de l'ouest, qui y existe bien longtemps avant l'urbanisation de la région. Celle-ci (l'urbanisation) devrait donc être perçue comme un facteur de déstructuration de l'élevage. L'argument que nous empruntons aux auteurs montre bien que l'élevage perd de sa prestance à mesure	

<p>que son espace d'expression est rétréci du fait de l'urbanisation. C'est à la lumière de cette analyse que nous suggérons aux auteurs la reformulation ci-après :</p> <p>L'élevage : une activité traditionnelle en déclin (du fait de l'urbanisation) dans les villes moyennes de l'ouest-Cameroun</p>	
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p>	
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Quelques erreurs mineurs subsistent. En raison de leur dispersion dans le texte, un suivi de modification est suggéré aux auteurs au mieux de leur faciliter la correction.</p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Les méthodes employées par les auteurs sont assez claires et connues. Cependant, elles discriminent le volet quantitatif de l'étude qui devrait pourtant être en vitrine, tout comme l'aspect qualitatif privilégié. Les raisons des choix opérés ne sont pas connues.</p>	
<p>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Pour une activité aussi florissante que l'élevage dans les villes de l'ouest, les résultats de la recherche donnent peu de place aux chiffres issus des marchés d'écoulement, les réseaux et flux de distribution ainsi que les gains générés par l'activité. Les encadrés ne suffisent malheureusement pas à nous renseigner suffisamment à ce sujet.</p> <p>La Figure 2 (p. 10) présente un diagramme assorti de valeurs relatives. Le lecteur la comprendrait mieux s'il avait au préalable un aperçu, fût-il global des données quantitatives sur les éleveurs, les ressources de l'élevage pratiqué selon l'espèce. Par exemple, combien d'éleveurs de caprins y a-t-il, et pour quel cheptel ? etc. Il y a donc à ce niveau un souci du détail. L'on aurait par ailleurs accueilli favorablement, dans la même lancée, la différence de rendements des deux systèmes d'élevages présentés par les auteurs, pour mieux apprécier les options porte le plus aux fins d'une éventualité de production de masse en faveur des différentes métropoles dépendantes des produits de cet élevage. Au total, le texte n'a pas été structuré, ce qui ne donne pas au lecteur l'appréciation de ses différentes articulations et/ou sous articulations.</p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>2,5</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>La conclusion gagnerait en pertinence si elle s'ajuste aux suggestions faites aux résultats de l'étude. Au demeurant, elle reste hative dans le cas de figure actuel : elle</p>	

sollicite que des rappels appuyés soient faits sur les faits concrets développés tout au long des résultats. Le travail n'émet pas de réserves traditionnelles reconnues à une étude scientifique.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

4,5

(Please insert your comments)

Les références bibliographiques sont appropriées. Cependant, elles n'ont pas suffisamment été convoquées dans le texte au regard du nombre affiché (29 au total), d'autant plus que peu d'entre elles y ont été référées. Les auteurs relèveraient la valeur conceptuelle du papier en y convoquant les références affichées.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	3,5
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): R-A-S

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: R-A-S