

Manuscript: “**Evaluation of the Sustainability of Urban Market Gardens in the City of Meknes (Morocco)**”

Submitted: 10 July 2021

Accepted: 04 November 2021

Published: 30 November 2021

Corresponding Author: Ibrahim Ibrahim

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n40p121

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: François Essouma Manga, *Institute of Agricultural Research for Development (IRAD)*

Reviewer 3: Olu-Ajayi, Funmilayo Elizabeth, Bamidele Olumilua University of Education Science and Technology/ Nigeria

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: <i>MANGA ESSOUMA François</i>	
University/Country: <i>Institute of Agricultural Research for Development (IRAD)</i>	
Date Manuscript Received: <i>07/10/2021</i>	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <i>Evaluation of the sustainability of urban market gardens in the city of Meknes (Morocco)</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <i>59_10_2021</i>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: 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	

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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The title is very clear and adequate to the content of the article</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> Yes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It is not explicit enough. Could you give more on the indicators and how you collected them?? How did you analyze your data and with what kind of analysis did you draw the conclusions?	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> How did you analyze and obtain these values that you present in your results? Explain in your methodology how did you obtained the points? And wouldn't it be better to present your results only with the percentages obtained from these points? That would save you a lot of writing. It is best to add up these scores in the table II next to the column of averages. Put the percentage of each indicator	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Some of the methodology can be found in the conclusion. Remove it.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The references are appropriate to the study but not presented according to the journal's framework	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author just needs to present the results better

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 26/10/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 30/10/2021
Manuscript Title: Evaluation of the Sustainability of Urban market-gardens in the city of Meknes, Morocco.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1059/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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> The title is okay. Authors should be clearly specified	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Need to summarize your results, it took the largest part of the abstract.</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>a. Some repetition of words need to be recast in article examples are: 'several African Countries, as well as Countries around the world' 'living beings, both human and animals'</p> <p>b. et al should be use only in subsequent citing of references, after the first full (stating every author's name) citing.</p> <p>c. Amend the use of brackets and punctuations where more than one reference are cited alongside themselves in the article.</p> <p>d. some words are joined together (spacing arrangement)</p> <p>E. local dialect words like 'Nzaha' should be italized</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p><i>11.3.1 There is the need to clearly explain the study method rather than flooding with references.</i></p> <p><i>First write full names and terms before the use of acronyms e g IDPM</i></p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>Remove 'points' from the average values e.g 2.34 points should be 2.34</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Okay	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>Need to employ a consistent referencing style</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):

The topic is researchable. Endeavor to effect the above stated amendments.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
The study is publishable**