

Paper: “Genre et pouvoir de prise de décision du type et de l’heure de repas: implications pour la sécurité alimentaire des ménages au Nord-Bénin (Afrique de l’Ouest)”

Submitted: 04 August 2021

Accepted: 16 August 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Janvier Egah

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n33p241](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n33p241)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gnamien Konan Bah Modeste
Jean Lorougnon Guede University, Cote d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Guy Edoun
Université d'Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Bénin

Reviewer 3: Karima Laamiri
University of Moulay Ismail, Morocco

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)

Le titre est clair

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.


*

(Please insert your comments)



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

(Please insert your comments)



The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Les méthodes de travail sont assez expliquées.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)


il vaut mieux respecter la présentation suivie par ESJ.

la présentation du travail de chaque auteur est à éviter.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)



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)

les références doivent être placées en bas de page.

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):

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)

Le titre mérite d’être plus spécifique, car l’article ne traite pas tous les aspects de la sécurité alimentaire (Qualité de l’alimentation, production agricole ect...) Il traite uniquement le pouvoir de décision lié aux choix des types de repas à consommer dans les ménages et l’heure de prise...

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Le résumé est bien élaboré et présentent clairement les objectifs, la méthode et les résultats.

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

(Please insert your comments)

Les erreurs grammaticales sont moindres.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

La méthodologie est clairement expliquée mais les auteurs doivent mentionner clairement le champs disciplinaire dans lequel s'inscrit l'étude.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

Les résultats sont claires et pertinents.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

La conclusion traduit fidèlement le contenu.

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)

Les références sont complètes et appropriées.

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):

J'encourage les auteurs à prendre en compte toutes les observations pour améliorer davantage le document.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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 TITLE is clear

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, ABSTRACT is clearly

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

(Please insert your comments)

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The study method needs to be revised to correct the huge shortcomings.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The content of the paper is quite clear but must be reviewed to improve the few shortcomings

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion is quite good with some improvements to be made

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 REFERENCE is comprehensive

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):

The paper is quite interesting but the methodology must be reviewed in depth. You also have to look at the presentation of the paper by presenting the results first and then doing the analysis. Review some results that give the impression of being forced.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: