

**Paper: “Enjeux Socio-Economiques de la Fourniture Decentralisee d’electricite dans l’extreme Nord-Est du Benin, Departement de l’Alibori”**

**Submitted: 28 September 2021**

**Accepted: 26 November 2021**

**Published: 30 November 2021**

Corresponding Author: Dominique Boko

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n39p98

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ouattara M. Zanga

Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly – Korhogo, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Toussaint Cokou Dan

Univerité d’Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Reviewer 3: Boubacar Solly

Assane SECK university of Ziguinchor, Sénégal

# ***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: Boubacar SOLLY	
University/Country: Assane SECK university of Ziguinchor/ Sénégal	
Date Manuscript Received: 06/10/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/10/2021
Manuscript Title: <b>ENJEUX SOCIOECONOMIQUES DE LA FOURNITURE DECENTRALISEE D'ELECTRICITE DANS L'EXTREME NORD-EST DU BENIN, DEPARTEMENT DE L'ALIBORI</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1034/21	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les références ne respectent aucune norme scientifique. En plus, elles sont à augmenter entre 5 et 10 de plus.	

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Les auteurs gagneraient à documenter davantage leur article, corriger les fautes, expliquer certains concepts, bien citer les références.

Les figures doivent être citées avant d'être présentées.

Il faut aussi éviter les phrases trop longues.

La conclusion et les références bibliographiques sont à réécrire.

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Cette article doit faire l'objet d'une nouvelle révision. A l'état elle n'est pas publiable.

# 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: TOUSSAINT COKOU DAN	
University/Country: Univerité d'Abomey-Calavi/BENIN	
Date Manuscript Received: Octobre 12, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: Octobre 18, 2021
Manuscript Title: SOCIOECONOMIC ISSUES OF THE DECENTRALIZED SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY IN THE FAR NORTHEAST OF BENIN, DEPARTMENT OF L'ALIBORI.	
<b>ESJ Manuscript Number: 1034/21</b>	
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]

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
(The article is about an interesting, topical subject aimed at deepening the debate on decentralized electricity. The subject is clear and suited to the content of the article.)	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
The summary of the article presented by the author clearly shows the objectives of the study, the methodology used to achieve the objectives and finally the main results of the study.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Very well written typographically, grammatically and stylistically. Very few mistakes.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
The methods used are well explained in the article, well detailed but also scientifically valid.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
The methods used are well explained in the article, well detailed but also scientifically valid and their interpretations are well linked to the objectives. The results do not contain errors.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
The author's conclusions are correct in relation to the objectives of the study and supported by the content of the article.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
provided and appropriate. Works generally recent and well presented. This is a well-researched article.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This article deals with a subject of great importance and very sensitive socio-economically. However, the article can show in its development that decentralized electrical equipment contributes to local development and that the population of the study area benefits from the development of decentralized electricity in the field of diversification of income-generating activities, reduction in the illiteracy rate, access to information and communication by radio, television and mobile phones, etc. The author

can also analyze the impact of decentralized electricity management on the population once the life cycle has been reached.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**RAS**