



Paper: “Culture de l’anacarde, Pression Foncière et Durabilité de l’igname Kponan de Bondoukou”

Corresponding Author: Kouakou Philipps Kouakou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n25p74

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Koffi Simplicie Yao
Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Koffi Brou Emile
Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d’Ivoire

Published: 30.09.2020

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: KOFFI Brou Emile	
University/Country: Université Alassane Ouattara / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Culture de l'anacarde et pression foncière dans le Nord-Est ivoirien	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 32.09.2020	
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>	
Le sujet aurait pu être « compétition entre la culture de l'anacarde et les cultures vivrières dans le Nord Est ivoirien »	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

RAS	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Niveau d'écriture soutenu	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La repartition de l'échantillon par village n'est pas donnée	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La rubrique "Résultats" n'apparaît pas clairement dans le corps du travail	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> RAS	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> RAS	

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):

Les observations sont continues dans le texte en mode révision

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: KOFFI Simplice Yao	
University/Country: Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 03/09/2020
Manuscript Title: Culture de l'anacarde et pression foncière dans le Nord-Est ivoirien	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0932/20	
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.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre est clair, mais il n'est pas en relation avec le contenu de l'article. Il faut revoir le titre en considérant nos observations.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résumé a pris en compte les objectifs, la méthodologie et les résultats.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> L'article est très bien rédigé. On ne note pas de fautes grammaticales et d'orthographe.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthodologie de l'article a été bien expliquée.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Je ne comprends pas pourquoi vous parlez de sécurité alimentaire dans le corps de votre article. Je pense que tous les arguments évoqués doivent être en lien avec les réalités de la pression foncière qui est suscitée par la culture de l'anacarde et qui menace les cultures vivrières en général et l'igname <i>Kponan</i> en particulier.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La conclusion de l'article est en relation avec le contenu de l'article. Mais, il faut éviter de citer les auteurs dans la conclusion.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La manière de rédiger les références bibliographiques est appropriée.	

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):

Votre article est très bien rédigé et aborde un sujet intéressant. En effet, l'essor de la culture de l'anacarde en lien avec la pression foncière pose le problème de la viabilité des cultures vivrières en général et celle de l'igname *Kponan* en particulier. Cependant, il est difficile de mettre en relation cette réalité et la sécurité alimentaire dans la mesure où les revenus issus de la vente de la noix de cajou peuvent servir à s'approvisionner en produits alimentaires sur les marchés. Pour éviter la confusion, je suggère que votre article se limite à la culture de l'anacarde et à la pression foncière qu'elle suscite dans le Nord-Est ivoirien sans oublier la menace qu'elle fait peser sur la viabilité des cultures vivrières en général et l'igname *Kponan* en particulier.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Nous donnons notre accord pour la publication de cet article après la prise en compte des observations mineures faites.