

Manuscript: “Analyse Des Effets De L’adoption Des Variétés Améliorées De Maïs Sur La Sécurité Alimentaire Du Ménage De L’adoptant Au Nord-Bénin”

Submitted: 22 June 2021

Accepted: 03 August 2021

Published: 31 August 2021

Corresponding Author: Yessifou Ayédesso Joski

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n29p298

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Zounon Christian Serge Félix
Université Abdou Moumouni de Niamey

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Akpinfa Edouard
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

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: Akpinfa Edouard	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi/Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/07/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/07/2021
Manuscript Title: Analyse des effets de l'adoption des variétés améliorées de maïs sur la sécurité alimentaire du ménage de l'adoptant au Nord-Bénin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0717/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No 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.	4

<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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<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	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Article bien rédigé. Bonne méthodologie. Résultats bien présentés