

Manuscript: “**Etude Comparative De La Rentabilité Des Systèmes De Pompage Solaire Et Thermique Sur Le Périmètre Irrigué De Soumarana Au Niger**”

Submitted: 09 December 2021

Accepted: 28 December 2021

Published: 31 December 2021

Corresponding Author: Illiassou NAROUA

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n43p246

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: ADAMOU Mahaman Moustapha, Université Abdou Moumouni de Niamey, Niger

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Bouzidi Belkacem, Development Centre of Renewable Energies/Algiers-Algeria

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: ADAMOU Mahaman Moustapha | |
| University/Country: Université Abdou Moumouni de Niamey, Niger | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 11 décembre 2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 12 décembre 2021 |
| Manuscript Title: Etude comparative de la rentabilité des systèmes de pompage solaire et thermique : Cas du périmètre irrigué de Soumarana au Niger | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 72.12.2021 | |
| 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. | 4 |
| <i>I propose to modify the title : Etude comparative de la rentabilité des systèmes de pompage solaire et thermique sur le périmètre irrigué de Soumarana au Niger (insert your comments)</i> | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 3 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 3 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)the comments are in the text</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. | |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)my comments are in the text</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <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 | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): see the text

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Bouzidi | |
| University/Country: Development Centre of Renewable Energies/Algiers-Algeria | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 11/12/2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: |
| Manuscript Title: Comparative study of the profitability of solar and fuel powered pumping systems: Case of the Soumarana irrigated perimeter in Niger | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 1272/21 | |
| 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>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and | 3.5 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| results. | |
| <i>The summary provides an overview of the study carried out on a number of samples representing the operators. The main results have been shown. However, the working method is less presented.</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 2 |
| <i>There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes to correct in this article. (Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 2 |
| <i>The method of calculation adopted is not very clear. Lacks some definition and formulation for understanding the results</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 2.5 |
| <i>The results seem correct, although some are incomprehensible for lack of proper explanation. Serious economic study is indicated given the importance of pumping systems by renewable energy in these regions of Africa (Sahel countries)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 2.5 |
| <i>A very light conclusion, concrete proposals for large-scale use would have been appreciated</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 5 |
| <i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In the poor regions of Africa (Sahel and Sahara countries) pumping by renewable energies takes on a very particular character; financially and environmentally. A complete and meticulous technical-economic study is very important and above all comprehensive. Keep in mind that your study should be understood by all scientists of different specialties.

Improvements and corrections are needed in your study.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Interesting work insofar as the authors are interested in a major problem of poor regions of Africa, the energy and food deficit. However, I have

expressed reservations in particular on the method used which should be more elaborate and more complete. Grammar and spelling mistakes to correct, a conclusion to be enriched, and proposals for a more reactive use of the renewable energy source