

Paper: “Enjeux Liés à la Traversée de la Frontière Bénino-Togolaise dans le Secteur Materi-Mandouri”

Submitted: 17 August 2021

Accepted: 25 December 2021

Published: 31 December 2021

Corresponding Author: Abdou Madjidou Maman Tondro

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n42p86](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n42p86)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Linda Pamela Kamgne Kamwa
Université de Dschang, Cameroun

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: Linda Pamela Kamgne Kamwa	
University/Country: Université de Dschang Cameroun	
Date Manuscript Received: 13 sept 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 22 sept 2021
Manuscript Title: TRAVERSEE DE LA FRONTIERE BENINO-TOGOLAISE DANS LE SECTEUR GOUANDE-MANDOURI : ENTRE OPPORTUNITES ET CALVAIRE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1857-7881 1857-7431	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Le titre n'est pas en adéquation avec les éléments du texte	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Le résumé est à refaire dans son ensemble. Absence de problème, de méthodologie, de rigueur, de plan	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Un langage non scientifique	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
La méthode est à revoir et à travailler. Tenir compte de nos remarques	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Il ne sait pas faire la différence entre résultats et analyse.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
A revoir du début à la fin	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Il massacre les citations et la présentation des auteurs. Ce n'est pas conforme à une rédaction scientifique	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Il est question pour l'auteur de maîtriser en premier son sujet. Par la suite, établir et définir ses concepts. Bien définir et délimiter sa zone d'étude, faire des recherches documentaires sur le sujet et mettre sur pied une méthodologie solide.

Revoir son langage

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

RAS