



Manuscript: **“Incidence Des Représentations Sociales Sur La Durabilité Sociale De L’aménagement Des Forêts Classées Des Monts Kouffé Et De Wari-Marô Au Bénin”**

**Submitted: 7 September 2020**

**Accepted: 28 September 2020**

**Published: 31 October 2020**

Corresponding Author: Baguiri Oumêmath

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n28p150

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Arouna Ousséni

National University of Sciences, Technologies, Engineering and Mathematics, Benin, West Africa

**Reviewer 2:** Akpona Adukê Inuya Nadège

Université de Parakou, Bénin

**Reviewer 3:** Blinded

# ***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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 08/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: « <i>Incidence des representations sociales sur la durabilitesociale de l'amenagement des foretsclassees des montskouffe et de wari-marou au benin</i> »	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper 099/20	
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.**

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b>
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
The title of the article is part of a sociological dynamic which aims to establish a link between the local logics of use of the forest cover and the vegetation preservation policies. the statement thus worded does not suffer from any ambiguities.	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>The authors give a good picture of the context of the study, the synthesis of the situation (report on indigenous logic and management policies of classified forests) is fairly well conducted. Also, the objective of the work is clearly presented. However, we note a concealment of the methodological process (qualitative or quantitative research method) and the theoretical framework of analysis</p>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p>This document presents some typographical errors, it is a matter of a disorder in the formatting also of the omissions in the writing of the text. A proofreading is necessary to resolve these errors.</p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>The methods of the study are clearly stated, it is about the questionnaire and the focused group but, the authors do not say which methodological procedures (ex sociographic, socio-anthropological study, social geography ...) take place these techniques sampling.</p>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>The body of the document is appropriately presented. However, it is not necessary to write a title specifically for the abstract since it is the same document. Also, the map presented lacks a source (who is the author).</p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>The conclusion and the summary are in line with the content of the work. Moreover, the conclusion does not say which theoretical framework of analysis made it possible to link the results according to the hypotheses and the objectives. It is content only to affirm the validation of the hypothesis from the results. As for the summary, it involves too many details on the sampling techniques while this exercise is specially addressed in the methodology section.</p>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p>The bibliography is realistic and bears witness to the state of the references searched by the authors. However, it suffers from irregularities related to punctuation and reference pages of certain documents consulted.</p>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The document is acceptable however, it must be proofread to prune spelling and grammar errors and clerical errors (such as information concerning the authors which should be put at the bottom of the page, punctuation problems which litter the document. , the quotes of the respondents which should be in italics, the words not in French also, should be in italics). In short, form shells somewhat tarnish the quality of the work.

**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: AROUNA Ousséni	Email:
University/Country: National University of Sciences, Technologies, Engineering and Mathematics/Benin, West Africa	
Date Manuscript Received: 08/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/09/2020
Manuscript Title: <b>INCIDENCE DES REPRESENTATIONS SOCIALES SUR LA DURABILITE SOCIALE DE L'AMENAGEMENT DES FORETS CLASSEES DES MONTS KOUFFE ET DE WARI-MARO AU BENIN</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0991/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**