

Manuscript: **“Perceptions Paysannes Des Aléas Climatiques Sur La Production Du Riz Sur Le Périmètre Irrigué De Saga Dans La Vallée Du Fleuve Niger”**

Submitted: 09 November 2021

Accepted: 19 January 2022

Published: 31 January 2022

Corresponding Author: Tahirou Moussa Seydou

Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n3p217

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Bonkougou Joachim, CNRST, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: YABI Hervé, Université d’Abomey-Calavi (Bénin)

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: Bonkougou Joachim	
University/Country: CNRST, Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 9 November 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 12 November 2021
Manuscript Title: Perceptions paysannes des effets des aléas climatiques sur la production du riz sur le périmètre irrigué de Saga dans la vallée du fleuve Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 61.11.2021	
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>(Please insert your 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.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Il est préférable de faire des phrases courtes : un sujet, un verbe un complément.
Certains mots ne sont compréhensibles. Le rapport est à relire et corriger les nombreuses fautes.

Mettre encore de l'effort dans la présentation de la méthodologie et des résultats.
Je conseille de lire le rapport 5 du GIEC où les principales notions de changement climatique sont explicitées.

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: YABI Hervé	Email:
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi (Bénin)	
Date Manuscript Received: 7-11-2019	Date Review Report Submitted: 17-12-2021
Manuscript Title: Perceptions paysannes des aléas climatiques sur la production du riz sur le périmètre irrigué de Saga dans la vallée du fleuve Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 61_11_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 published version 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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Le titre est adapté au contenu	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Le résumé doit être étoffé. La méthodologie se confond aux résultats (voir les observations).	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Un effort est fait. Toutefois, il y a des erreurs mineures avec des phrases trop complexes parfois	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
C'est bien fait mais le choix de l'échantillon pose encore problème. L'auteur doit renforcer encore la partie analyse des données en ajoutant les critères d'efficacité des stratégies d'adaptation.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Le développement est fait dans le cadre du sujet. Mais il y a absence d'harmonisation des numéros des tableaux. L'auteur a manqué d'aborder l'efficacité et les limites des stratégies. La discussion est un peu floue.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Effort appreciable.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Un effort d'harmonisation est à faire. L'auteur doit présenter les auteurs cités en précisant les noms et prénoms	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Le sujet est assez bien abordé. On sent qu'un effort a été fait. Il serait intéressant que l'auteur renforce la partie analyse des données et aborde l'efficacité et les limites des stratégies pour boucler son analyse.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Rien à signaler. Toutefois, merci à vous pour la confiance.