

Manuscript: “Accès À La Terre Et Profil De La Pauvreté Dans Le Delta Du Fleuve Sénégal”

**Submitted: 23 November 2020**

**Accepted: 21 January 2021**

**Published: 31 January 2021**

Corresponding Author: El Hadji Malick Sylla

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n3p360

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Seydou Alassane Sow,  
Sénégal

**Reviewer 2:** Folefack Denis Pompidou,  
Carbap, Cameroun

**Reviewer 3:** KRA Akoua Clarisse,  
Université Félix Houphouet-Boigny (Abidjan/Côte d’Ivoire)

**Reviewer 4:** PatienceMpanzu Balomba,  
Université de Kinshasa/ D R Congo

# ***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: Seydou Alassane SOW	
University/Country: Sénégal	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>Accès à la terre et profil de la pauvreté dans le delta du fleuve Sénégal</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 31 12 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]
<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>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>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

***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: KRA Akoua Clarisse	Email:
University/Country: Université Félix HOUPHOUET-BOIGNY (Abidjan/Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/01/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/01/2021
Manuscript Title: <b>Accès à la terre et profil de la pauvreté dans le delta du fleuve Sénégal</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 32.12.2020	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Oui)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Le résumé contient certes les objectifs, la méthode et les résultats mais doit être reformulé, être précis. )</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(L auteur doit: - adopter une écriture commune pour le terme (delta ou Delta); - faire de courtes phrases pour faciliter la compréhension car assez de phrases longues )</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Oui)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Oui)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Oui)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Les références bibliographiques doivent être harmonisées; les points et virgules entre les noms des auteurs)</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):**

Les parties marquées en jaune sont des ajouts que l'auteur doit prendre en compte et suggère que l'auteur prenne connaissance du modèle de rédaction de la revue pour améliorer l'article.

# *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: Université de Kinshasa/ D R Congo	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 01-16-2021
Manuscript Title: <b>Accès à la terre et profil de la pauvreté dans le delta du fleuve Sénégal</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 32.12.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b> You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## **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>The title is clear and represents the content of the article.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The abstract mention includes the three points</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>Please see the input in the text</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The results are clear and in line with the research issue.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The conclusions and the summary are based on the contents of the article.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</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):**

Some minor corrections and comments are in track change in the text. Please review the revised version.

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