



Paper: “Determinants Socio-Economiques de l’adoption des Modes de Vente de la Noix d’anacarde dans les Communes de Djougou, Tchaourou et Glazoue au Benin”

Corresponding Author: O. M. Franck Ronald Adjobo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n19p313

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kouakou Philipps Kouakou
Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Patience Mpanzu
BALOMBA, University of Kinshasa, D R Congo

Published: 31.07.2020

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!

Reviewer Name: Patience MPANZU BALOMBA	Email:
University/Country: University of Kinshasa, D R Congo	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Déterminants de l'adoption des Formes de vente de la noix d'anacarde au Nord et au centre du Benin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 36.06.2020.	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title reflects the content of the article. However, authors should add "Cashew" among keywords.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The abstract focused more on the methodology than on the results	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Indeed, there are some grammatical errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The conclusions can be improved (see comment in the text)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>For somme referencs the authors need to add precision on pages consulted (number of pages)</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):

Based on the results, I think it is important that the authors make some recommendations on the form od sale that would generate more income for producers. Authors must read the manuscript to see the inputs and comments I made in track change.

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!

Reviewer Name: Kouakou Philipps KOUAKOU	Email:
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët-BOIGNY, Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Déterminants de l'adoption des forme de vente de la noix d'anacarde au nord et au Sud du Bénin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 30.06.2020	
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: Yes	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre de l'article est bon dans l'ensemble, mais il peut être plus précis au regard de l'objectif développé. Exemple : Déterminants socio-économiques ...	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	2,5

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Le résumé de l'article manque de résultats concrets et saillants. Aussi, les méthodes de collecte de données n'y sont pas toutes mentionnées (Voir inputs)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les fautes grammaticales et d'orthographe sont négligeables. Cependant, l'emploi de certains termes ne sont pas maîtrisés, notamment « Exploitants et exploitations agricoles ». Ce qui complexifie la compréhension du manuscrit à plusieurs endroits.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
La méthodologie est bonne dans l'ensemble mais un peu trop détaillée. Les unités d'observation doivent être clairement revues au regard des objectifs de l'étude.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les résultats de l'étude sont mal restitués ; ils manquent d'explication et d'orientation précise (voir les inputs).	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
La conclusion devra être revue avec des résultats bien perceptibles, surtout en lien avec les remarques faites au corps de l'étude.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>Les références ont été générées de manière automatique. Cependant, certaines d'entre elle sont mal citées dans le coprs du manuscrit (revoir). Ecrire Chirwa, 2005 et non Chirwa 2005. Se conformer dans l'ensemble à la note aux auteurs de la revue.</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):

L'étude est pertinente dans l'ensemble, mais les résultats sont mal restitués. La majorité des variables ont besoin d'orientation précise. Dire par exemple que «80% des producteurs ayant plus de 60 ans pratiquent la vente individuelle. Les producteurs âgés ont donc la prédisposition à opter pour la vente individuelle » et **non se limiter à dire que l'âge est positivement corrélé à la vente individuelle, ce qui ne rend véritablement pas compte de la catégorie d'âge qui pratique la vente individuelle.**

Plusieurs outils (graphiques, schémas) peuvent servir à expliciter la restitution.

Aussi, les auteurs doivent tenir compte du fait que les lecteurs de l'article ne sont pas forcément économistes et adapter le manuscrit en conséquence.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Conformer la langue de la grille d'évaluation à celle de l'article.