

Manuscript: “**Caracterisation des Agrosystemes de la Commune de Gogounou au Nord-Est du Benin par Teledetection a Moyenne Resolution Spatiale**”

Submitted: 16 September 2020

Accepted: 23 March 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Hervé Koumassi

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n14p203

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Basson Fiacre, Université Joseph Ki-Zerbo/Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: Saly Sambou, Cheikh Anta Diop University

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: BASSON Fiacre	Email: basson_fiacre@yahoo.fr
University/Country :Université Joseph KI-ZERBO/Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 11/11/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/12/2020
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation des agrosystèmes de la commune de Gogounou au Nord-Est du Bénin par télédétection à moyenne résolution spatiale	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 09120/20	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<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>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Je voudrais avant tout proposer, féliciter les auteurs pour le manuscrit produit.

Cependant, les principales observations et suggestions se présentent comme suit :

- Relecture du manuscrit pour corriger les fautes et la redondance de certaines informations aux niveaux du résumé, de la méthodologie, des résultats et discussions ainsi que de la conclusion.
- Absence d'objectifs spécifiques du manuscrit, il faudra en proposer
- Explication du choix des exploitants enquêtés, la détermination de la taille de l'échantillon, l'approche et la période des enquêtes
- Proposition d'un point à part entière pour les données qualitatives et la proposition pourrait être enquête auprès des producteurs avec des sous points

- Justification de certains éléments comme les périodes d'acquisition des images SPOT , l'utilisation des images SPOT et du NDVI en se basant sur la revue de la littérature existante
- Valoriser les résultats des enquêtes réalisées à travers un paragraphe dans la partie résultats. Il faut un point sur les producteurs enquêtés (superficie des exploitations, les équipements, les pratiques agricoles, les caractéristiques socio-démographiques des producteurs)
- Absence d'une véritable discussion des résultats obtenus (à titre illustratif, on ne perçoit pas la comparaison des résultats à d'autres études antérieures et aussi les justifications des résultats obtenus)
- Numéroté les références comme recommandé par le guide des auteurs

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: Saly Sambou	
University/Country: Cheikh Anta Diop University	
Date Manuscript Received: 23 February 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 18 March 2021
Manuscript Title: CARACTERISATION DES AGROSYSTEMES DE LA COMMUNE DE GOGOUNOU AU NORD-EST DU BENIN PAR TELEDETECTION A MOYENNE RESOLUTION SPATIALE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 120.09.2020	
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>Nothing to report</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract presents the objectives, methodology and results of the study.</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Some mistakes were noted, see annotations in the article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Nothing to report</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results are clear.</i>	
<i>However, we note that the subtitle “3.2. Caractéristiques des agrosystèmes de la commune de Gogounou » is not developed (see annotations in the article).</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Nothing to report</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Some references cited in the article are not mentioned in the bibliography.</i>	
<i>On the other hand, others mentioned in the bibliography are not cited in the article. They are underlined in yellow.</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):

First of all, I would like to congratulate the authors for the quality of the paper.

I suggest the authors make the necessary corrections to improve the quality of the article (see annotations in the text).