

Manuscript: “**Strategies D’adaptation Des Agropasteurs Aux Changementsclimatiques Dans La Commune Rurale De Diema (Mali)**”

**Submitted: 18 August 2021**

**Accepted: 04 February 2022**

**Published: 28 February 2022**

Corresponding Author: Dommo Timbely

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n8p21

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Talahatou Tabou, Abomey-Calavi

**Reviewer 2:** Blinded

# ***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: TABOU Talahatou	
University/Country: Abomey-Calavi	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/10/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/10/2021
Manuscript Title: <b>STRATEGIES D'ADAPTATION DES AGROPASTEURS AUX CHANGEMENTSCLIMATIQUES DANS LA COMMUNE RURALE DE DIEMA (MALI)</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0909/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	

## **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>2</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Vos références sont à reprendre</i>	

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

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

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

Il faut réorganiser vos résultats.

# ***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!***

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: STRATEGIES D'ADAPTATION DES AGROPASTEURS AUX CHANGEMENTSCLIMATIQUES DANS LA COMMUNE RURALE DE DIEMA	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Pthe title does not reflect the comments.lease insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(the summary does not highlight the salient findings of the document.Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(the document has fewer grammatical and spelling errors. Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(the methodology is long, it can be better synthesised for a scientific article)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(the results are clear but not well commented)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(the conclusion does not highlight the results obtained.)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The bibliographic reference is appropriate)</i>	

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

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

The content of the document is not very appropriate to the results, the conclusion and the summary

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

Reformulation of the title and a good analysis of the results as well as the conclusion and summary