



Manuscript: **“Evaluation de la pertinence des projets et programmes de développement rural au Cameroun”**

**Submitted: 12 August 2020**

**Accepted: 21 October 2020**

**Published: 31 October 2020**

Corresponding Author: Awe Baina Modeste

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p105

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Koffi Alexandre Yao

Université Félix Houphouet Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

**Reviewer 2:** Blinded

**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: Yao Koffi Alexandre	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouet Boigny (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/08/2020
Manuscript Title: <a href="#">Evaluation de la pertinence des projets et programmes de développement rural au Cameroun</a>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0888/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <span style="color: red;">Yes</span> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <span style="color: red;">Yes</span> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <span style="color: red;">Yes</span> /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>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>Le résumé ne présente pas au niveau de la démarche méthodologique, les outils de collecte et l'échantillon de la population qui doivent permettre d'apprécier les résultats.</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Acceptable dans l'ensemble</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Trop de redondance dans la méthodologie, ce qui nécessite une synthèse, une harmonisation	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Je suggère que le texte soit lu plus calmement afin d'enlever toutes les petites fautes dans le texte et le compléter par les mots manquants et la ponctuation.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>La conclusion contient trop de parties évasives qui méritent d'être retirées en vue de garder l'essentiel qui doit être une réponse à la question de départ.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Pour les références bibliographiques, j'ai noté que les pages de certaines références ne sont pas précisées. Et d'autres méritent d'être bien citées. Aussi Voir les commentaires.</b>	

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

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

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

**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:08/21/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/01/2020
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la pertinence des projets et programmes de développement rural au Cameroun	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 88.08.2020	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
-----------	---

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title seems clear but the content as addressed does not seem to follow the methodology generally used in the assessment of relevance.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract contains a few mistakes and unclear sentences. The recommendations presented seem vague. The results occupy less than half of the abstract.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are some grammatical errors, spelling mistake and figures mistakes.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study methods are explained but there are some confusions. Also, the methodology section is too long and not focused. Authors need to be more focused present the most important points of the methodology for a better understanding of how the study was conducted.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The body of the text seems clear but contains too much literature whereas the study, as presented in the methodology, is empirical. There is a lot of text and the interpretation of the results is still not clear.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The structure of the presentation of the conclusion should be improved. I recommend that authors refer to other articles for inspiration.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> I did not find any references on techniques for monitoring and evaluating development projects and programs. And yet the evaluation of projects, in particular the evaluation of relevance, is the focus of the study.	

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

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

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

Authors should thoroughly review the article and review the methodology. They should consult the references on project evaluation methods. Surveys of beneficiaries is a good thing but gives more the impression of a satisfaction study. At the level of beneficiaries, the survey should focus on their problems and constraints and check how the projects / programs have taken them into account or not in order to solve them.

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