

Manuscript: “**Agriculture À Base D’anacarde Et Formes Traditionnelles De Mobilisation De La Main D’oeuvre Agricole Chez Les Fohobélé Au Centre-Nord De La Côte d’Ivoire**”

Submitted: 27 April 2021

Accepted: 29 May 2021

Published: 30 June 2021

Corresponding Author: Ouattara Nanfouhoro Paul-Kévin

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n21p265

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Adaman Sinan, : Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo, Cote d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Chaimaâ Merbouh, Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: SINAN ADAMAN	Email:
University/Country: Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo (Cote d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 07 / 05/ 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 09 /05/ 2021
Manuscript Title: Agriculture à base d'anacarde et formes traditionnelles de mobilisation de la main d'œuvre agricole chez les Fohobélé au Centre-Nord de la Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 14204-Article -Text-41567-1-4-20210427	
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.	
<p><i>Le titre de l'article est acceptable. Mais il doit être reformulé.</i> Le titre est acceptable. Mais il doit être légèrement reformulé. J'ai donc proposé un nouveau titre.</p>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résumé est aussi bon.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le style de l'article est clair et facile à lire. Le texte est bien écrit, aéré et les phrases sont simples. Le contenu est facile à lire. Cependant, il y a quelques fautes mineures à corriger.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> L'auteur a fait usage des méthodes conformes à sa discipline.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats exposés dans le document sont conformes au plan de rédaction de l'articles. Ils sont donc acceptables.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les conclusions partielles ne sont pas présentes mais cela n'enlève pas au texte sa qualité scientifique. La conclusion générale est acceptable.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les références bibliographiques sont acceptables. Mais il y a quelques corrections à apporter.	

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):

Nous disons à l'auteur de prendre en compte les observations faites avant la publication de l'article.

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

YES.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

YES.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

YES.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

La partie méthodologie est très bien élaborée.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

YES. With almost no grammatical errors.

(Les corrections à prendre en considération sont laissés en commentaire)

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

YES.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

YES.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5

Please rate the *BODY* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *CONCLUSION* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *REFERENCES* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Les auteurs ont réalisé une étude intéressante et très pertinente. Le sujet est très intéressant et délicat qui touche à la vie humaine. Il a été développé avec une très bonne synthèse bibliographique.