

Manuscript: “**Déterminants Sociotechniques De L'élevage De La Volaille Au Sein Des Concessions Dans La Commune De Bambey, Sénégal**”

Submitted: 03 May 2021

Accepted: 28 September 2021

Published: 30 November 2021

Corresponding Author: Abdou Khadre Fall

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n40p158

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Vikou Ronaldess, Benin

Reviewer 2: Kora Gounou Mohamed, Université de Parakou

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Aman Jean Baptiste, Université Nangui Abrogoua

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: VIKOU Ronaldess	
University/Country: BENIN	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/08/2021
Manuscript Title: Étude sociotechnique de l'élevage de la volaille au sein des concessions dans la commune de Bambey, Sénégal	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0565/21	
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.	5
<i>Not 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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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	

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: KORA GOUNOU Mohamed	
University/Country: Université de Parakou	
Date Manuscript Received: 24 août 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 02 septembre 2021
Manuscript Title: Étude sociotechnique de l'élevage de la volaille au sein des concessions dans la commune de Bambey, Sénégal	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	2
<i>Le titre ne permet pas de comprendre l'objectif du travail</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>Le résumé ne ressort pas le problème qui se pose, la méthodologie dans le travail. Les résultats présentés sont plus descriptifs.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Il y a peu de fautes grammaticales. Cependant, il y a des phrases non compréhensibles.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>La méthodologie suivie dans le cadre du travail n'est pas présentée.</i>	

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Les methods d'estimation pour aboutir aux résultats ne sont pas exposées.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>La conclusion est un peu longue. Elle peut être résumée</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Je propose aux auteurs de revoir méthodologie pour permettre d'améliorer la qualité scientifique du travail.

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: AMAN Jean Baptiste	
University/Country: Université NANGUI ABROGOUA	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/09/2021
Manuscript Title: Étude sociotechnique de l'élevage de la volaille au sein des concessions dans la commune de Bambey, Sénégal	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 65.05.2021	

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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> the title is pertinent, descriptive and concise	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract is written according to scientific standards. It mentions the objective of the work, summarizes the study methods and presents the main results</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> This paper is written with a lot of incomprehensible sentences	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Study methods are concise	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The paper contain new data and new ideas but the results are not well presented. However, these results were clearly analyzed	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusion presents a clear summary of the main results obtained	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Some references have not been listed in alphabetical order and by year of publication	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In the discussion present your main results and discuss them as things progress. If you need to compare your results with those of other authors, start by putting your own before others and justifying any differences or similarities. Rephrase your sentences so that we can better follow you in your reasoning. Include in your text, all the tables and figures that you announce.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper contains new data et new ideas. It therefore deserves to be published. However, the author should not only better present his results in tables, figures and graphs before analyzing them. Also, he will have to better organize these ideas at the level of the discussion and reformulate several sentences to make them more understandable.