

Manuscript: “**Déterminants Socio-Économiques De L’adoption Des Technologies Agro Écologiques De Productions Agricoles Dans Le Département De Mayahi Au Niger**”

Submitted: 29 September 2021

Accepted: 24 November 2021

Published: 31 December 2021

Corresponding Author: Mahamane Moctar Rabe

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n43p73

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oumarou Haladou Issoufou

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Léon H. Akpatcho

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2021-10-14 05:23 PM

Recommendation: Accept Submission

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

yes

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.

Le titre est très pertinent car il aborde une question importante pour l'intensification de l'agriculture pluviale au Niger principale source de nourriture et de revenu de la majorité de la population.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Le résumé est clair car présente l'objectif, la méthodologie et les résultats de l'étude. Toutefois, il est pertinent d'ajouter une phrase de contexte au début. Pour chaque variable, veuillez préciser le niveau de significativité (1%, 5% ou 10%).

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

Le texte est très bien écrit, facile à lire et pas de fautes.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

La méthodologie de l'étude est détaillée et pertinente. Toutefois, Il manque une justification claire du choix des variables et le modèle de l'étude. Veuillez ajouter un tableau sur la description des variables du modèle et la méthode de calcul du taux d'adoption des technologies.

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

Le corps du document est bien présenté. Cependant, dans le tableau 1, est-il possible de regrouper les technologies en 3 grands groupes et calculer le taux d'adoption selon les groupes suivants : i) gestion de la fertilité des sol, ii) lutte contre les ennemies de culture et iii) alimentation animale?

Au niveau du tableau 3: Veuillez ajouter les colonnes sur le coefficient et les effets marginaux; les paramètres de validité du modèle. Par ailleurs, le tableau est trop grand, est-il possible de reprendre l'analyse sur la base de 3 grands groupes de technologies : i) gestion de la fertilité des sol, ii) lutte contre les ennemies de culture et iii) alimentation animale?

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

La conclusion est bien rédigée. Je n'ai pas de commentaires.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Veuillez revoir la bibliographie car il y a 12 auteurs cités dans le texte mais qui ne figurent pas dans la liste des références (exemple SPR, 2013 ; SCSAO, 2005 ; Sani et Bagna, 2007 ; MAG-SDR, 2010 ; etc.). Il y a également 2 auteurs qui figurent dans la liste des références mais non cités dans le texte (Hurlin, 2003 et Dugje et al, 2009).

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 Editors Only:

Pas de commentaires.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2021-10-26 09:34 PM

Recommendation: Revisions Required

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

YES

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.

The title is very clear

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The summary is conform to the ESJ's framework. It includes the objective (analyze of the adoption of agricultural technologies determinants), includes the methodology (regression) and includes the resul

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

There is some gramatical errors

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology is not well referenced. It is not known which sampling approach is adopted. It is also not known whether the sample is representative. More over, the of selecting the study area is elucidated.

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

The body of the paper is clear but the author should remove some errors

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

The conclusion is clear

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is not correct. Some authors have been cited without having been used (Hurlin C. 2003; or Sermé I, Outtara K, Logah V, Taounda JB, Pale S, Quansah C, Abaidoo R. 2015; for intance)

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