

Manuscript: “**Productivité Et Rôles Socio-Économiques Des Cultures Maraîchères Dans Les Communes De Tibiri Gobir Et De Madarounfa (Niger)**”

Submitted: 11 November 2021

Accepted: 17 December 2021

Published: 28 February 2022

Corresponding Author: Younoussou Rabo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n8p188

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Simplicite Yao KOFFI, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: VIKOU Ronaldess, Benin

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: Simplicite Yao KOFFI	
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 16 novembre 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 22 novembre 2021
Manuscript Title: Productivité et rôles socio-économiques des cultures maraîchères sur les sites maraîchers des communes de Tibiri gobir et de Madarounfa	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1174/21	
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>(Le titre de l'article est clair. Mais, il est essential dy ajouter la localization géographique des communes de Tibiri gobir et de Madarounfa et le pays)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(L'approche méthodologique est floue dans le résumé. Il faut essayer de synthétiser les résultats)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Le document, dans l'ensemble, comporte peu de fautes grammaticales)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Les méthodes de de recherché ne sont pas claires. En outre, rien n'a été dit sur la méthode de détermination des rendements des différentes cultures alors que cet aspect a été discuté dans l'article)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Il y a dix (10) niveaux pour l'analyse des résultats quand l'on considère les sous-titres. Nous estimons que cela est énorme. Par conséquent, nous demandons que les résultats soient regroupés en trois (3) niveaux maximum. Cela permettra aux auteurs de mieux cerner les résultats de leur étude)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>(La conclusion n'est pas acceptable pour une telle étude. Elle doit être reprise totalement)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Bon dans l'ensemble)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Les auteurs abordent un sujet intéressant qui entre dans le cadre du développement des cultures maraîchères dans la ville et autour des villes africaines. Il s'agit donc d'un pan de l'agriculture urbaine et péri-urbaine. Même si l'article est bien écrit, son organisation mérite d'être revue. Cela permettra aux auteurs de mieux cerner leur sujet et de faire une bonne conclusion fondée sur des éléments vérifiables et tangibles. Nous pensons que les résultats peuvent être organisés en trois (3) niveaux notamment:

3.1. Caractéristiques socio-démographiques des producteurs et organisations des cultures sur les sites maraîchers

- 3.2. Classification et usages des produits maraîchers
 3.3. Rendements et rentabilité financière des cultures maraîchères

NB: Ce n'est qu'une proposition. Nous pensons que les auteurs peuvent s'inspirer de cette proposition pour bien organiser leur travail.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Nous estimons que les auteurs doivent prendre en compte toutes les observations avant que leur article soit publié.

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: VIKOU Ronaldess	
University/Country: BENIN	
Date Manuscript Received: 26/11/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/12/2021
Manuscript Title: Productivité et rôles socioéconomiques des cultures maraîchères sur les sites maraîchers des communes de Tibiri gobir et de Madarounfa	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1174/21	
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>Not 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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<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	