

Paper: **“Incidences des Trajectoires Professionnelles sur l’Entrepreneuriat dans la Ville de Cotonou au Benin”**

Submitted: 12 February 2022

Accepted: 09 March 2022

Published: 31 March 2022

Corresponding Author: Tohon Sètongninougbo Hermann Eric

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n9p129

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Baguri Oumêmath
University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin Republic

Reviewer 2: Kodjoh Essoh Steve G.
Université Félix Houphouet-Boigny d’Abidjan, Cote d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: 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!

Date Manuscript Received: 18/02/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Impacts of professional trajectories on entrepreneurship	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0268/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
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
The title is concise, but somewhat lacking in precision. The author does not specify the type of impact (social, economic, etc.) in question here.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract is clear and coherent, it presents an object (creation and organization of a company), a study method (analysis of the dispersion of sequences), results (It appears.... The organization of business).	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The text is well written and has few grammatical and spelling errors. Reading is easy and understandable.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The quantitative method (sequence dispersion analysis) is well carried out in the restitution of the results and finds the correlation in the analysis carried out.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The result is correlated with the method defined, however, the use of certain quotations in English causes confusion on the register of language used, ie the text is in French, then the quotations must also be in French. Either the text is English then the bibliographical references must also be English. Also, the graphic images of the text must indicate the sources (provenance). In addition, the text is well written and in adequacy with the axes of study.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusion is the balance sheet of the work carried out by the author.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The bibliographical references are in line with those contained in the body of the work.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author must obligatorily conform the quotations in English of the text to the French language, because the text is in French. It should also set the last sentence of the theoretical framework to the same font (Times new roman 12) as the rest of the text. The author has carried out a good job which should be published as of the minor corrections which relate to the problems of the conformity of the language of the quotations, source of the graphic figures and the leveling of the font of writing (the last sentence of the theoretical framework).

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 18/02/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/02/2022
Manuscript Title: Incidence des trajectoires professionnelles sur l'entrepreneuriat	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0268/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.	2
Le titre est en adéquation avec le contenu du travail mais ne contient pas la zone d'étude.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1

Le résumé ne présente pas du tout l'objectif de l'étude et la méthodologie employée. Les résultats présentés ne contiennent pas les pourcentages. Pourtant c'est une étude quantitative.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Un effort a été fait car il y a peu de faute de grammaire et d'orthographe dans ce travail.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats sont très longs ; il faut les subdiviser.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les conclusions ou le résumé doivent contenir l'objectif de l'étude et la méthodologie. Les résultats doivent être donnés avec les proportions ou les pourcentages dans la conclusion et le résumé car c'est une étude quantitative.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Si vous précisez par moment les pages, il convient de faire de meme pour tous les auteurs.	

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):

Rien à signaler

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Je pense qu'il y a une différence entre bibliographie et référence bibliographique. Le thème approprié dans cet article est référence bibliographique.

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: BAGUIRI Oumêmath, PhD	
University/Country: University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin Republic	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/02/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 03/03/2022
Manuscript Incidences des trajectoires professionnelles sur l'entrepreneuriat	Title:
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>Le titre est très concis. Il manque cependant des précisions telles que la zone ou le milieu de recherche.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Les trois parties d'un bon résumé y figurent de façon succincte.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>De très rares fautes se remarquent dans le texte</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>La méthodologie est très bien détaillée</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Il a fallu se référer aux commentaires pour mieux comprendre les graphiques car les légendes étaient floues.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>La conclusion respecte les règles en la matière</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>La présentation des références bibliographiques est minutieuse</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):

NEANT

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: