

Manuscript: “Dégradation De La Fertilité Des Sols Et De L’environnement Dans La Région Des Savanes Au Nord-Togo : Analyse Des Perceptions Et Stratégies D’adaptation Indigènes”

Submitted: 29 March 2021

Accepted: 06 July 2021

Published: 31 July 2021

Corresponding Author: Magamana Abalo-Esso

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n25p40

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Barthelemy G. Honfoga, University of Abomey-Calavi, School of Economics, Socio-anthropology and Communication for Rural Development, Benin

Reviewer 2: Dr. Adabe Kokou Edoh, Enseignant chercheur à l'Université de Lomé, spécialité Agroéconomie et Agrobusiness

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)

L'article est trop long et manque de focus, en termes de diagnostic d'un certain nombre de relations causales.

Réduire le volume du papier et adresser les questions mentionnées ci-après dans le résumé en anglais et dans le corps du texte.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

You state here the purpose of the research. But what is the research problem addressed? The results presented in the abstract are about farmers' perception of soil and environment degradation. But then, how do this data/figures relate to farmers' potential for addressing soil degradation and climate change? Outputs from cross-tabulations and/or regression analysis are required.

What are the effects of the adopted resilience measures on soil degradation, soil fertility restoration and crop yields? Outputs from cross-tabulations and/or regression analyses are required.

The recommendation at the end of the abstract is not supported by any result of cause-to-effect analysis (i.e. inferential analysis. Crosstabs or regression analysis).

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

(Please insert your comments)

Not much.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Echantillonnage : Pourquoi n'avoir pas tenu compte plutôt de la population pour retenir le nombre de producteurs à choisir par village ?

Les données: Les données recueillies doivent être mentionnées/listées par objectif spécifique de la recherche.

Statistiques descriptives, tableaux, graphiques, etc.: Pour diagnostiquer quelles questions de recherche ou quel objectif, et avec quel outil d'analyse statistique de test de la relation entre la perception des producteurs sur l'état de dégradation des sols et de l'environnement et les pratiques de gestion de la fertilité des sols qu'ils adoptent ? La méthode d'analyse devrait porter d'abord sur cette description avant de parler des logiciels employés.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

L'analyse descriptive effectuée est trop détaillée et n'est pas convenable pour un article de revue scientifique. Est-il possible de relier les données sociodémographiques des producteurs à leurs perceptions sur la dégradation des sols et à leurs modes/pratiques de gestion de la fertilité des sols et de protection de l'environnement/adaptation au changement climatique?

Les résultats présentés dans les différentes sections de l'article (4.1 à 4.6) sont trop descriptifs. Il faut des résultats d'analyses de cause à effet.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

L'article n'a pas tiré de conclusion bien saisissante/captivante. Les constats faits n'ont pas été suffisamment expliqués. Le papier apparaît plus comme un rapport d'inventaire de méthodes de conservation des sols et eaux via les perceptions des producteurs, qu'un rapport de recherche pour diagnostiquer des relations de cause-à-effet pertinentes.

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)

Je note que très peu de travaux récents (post 2015) ont été cités et il n'y a pas assez de publications dans des revues scientifiques de renom sur le sujet étudié.

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):

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)

I suggest that the title should be modified as follows: Degré de fertilité des sols et de l'environnement dans la région des Savanes au nord-Togo : analyse des perceptions et stratégies originales d'adaptation

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

I suggest minor correction

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

(Please insert your comments)

There are a few grammatical errors in the article that I suggest correction

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The study methods are explained clearly but I make some suggestion in the document that need to be added

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of the paper is clear but there are minor errors that need to be corrected

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion is accurate and supported by the content

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)

The list of references is appropriate but the format of the references needed to be modified

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):

This is an original paper. There are some minure revision wich needed to be finalized