

Paper: “Caracterisation de l’espace frontalier du plateau au Sud-Est du Benin”

Submitted: 30 December 2021

Accepted: 24 February 2022

Published: 28 February 2022

Corresponding Author: Abdel Seidou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n7p90](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n7p90)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Abdoulaye Djafarou
University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin, Africa

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: ABDOULAYE Djafarou	
University/Country: Abomey-Calavi/Benin/Africa	
Date Manuscript Received: 26/01/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/02/2022
Manuscript Title: CARACTERISATION DE L'ESPACE FRONTALIER DU DEPARTEMENT DU PLATEAU AU SUD-EST DU BENIN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0132/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No : Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No: 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

(The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
(The abstract clearly but not presents the objects)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
(There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
(The study methods are not explained clearly)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
(The results are clear and contain a few errors because we don't know the objects before)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
(The conclusions are too small)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Yes but the authors should like to write the name and surname for the authors in the text)</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):

authors should take into account the remarks mentioned in the text to incorporate corrections

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: