

**Paper: “Impact of Cashew Nut Trade Policy on Household and Government Revenues in Senegal: A Dynamic Computable General Equilibrium Model Analysis”**

**Submitted: 06 December 2021**

**Accepted: 09 May 2022**

**Published: 31 May 2022**

Corresponding Author: Mamadou Abdoulaye Diallo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n15p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n15p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Greg E. Edame  
University of Calabar, Calabar-Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Mamadou Bobo Barry  
Cheikh Anta Diop of Dakar, Senegal

# ***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: Mamadou Bobo Barry	
University/Country: Cheikh Anta Diop of Dakar/Senegal	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>Impact of a cashew nut trade policy on household and government revenues in Senegal: an application using a Dynamic Computable General Equilibrium Model.</b>	
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] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>(I propose the following wording for greater clarity of the subject and conformity with the content of the text)</i>	
<b>Impact of a cashew export tax on economic activity, household incomes and government revenues in Senegal: an application using a dynamic computable general equilibrium model.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The summary is clear, the objectives are well detailed, the method well-presented and the reference. The results are also well presented taking into account the impact on the different sectors, households and the government)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Le texte est bien rédigé dans l'ensemble. Il y a juste quelques coquilles minimes dont une simple relecture permettrait de les corriger. J'en ai souligné quelques-unes dans le texte.)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(La démarche est bien expliquée et la source d'inspiration de l'étude est également présentée. Les équations du modèle sont bien détaillées. Toutefois, certains paramètres et la signification de certaines variables ne sont pas expliqués dans la spécification des modèles)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	
<i>(Les résultats sont très fournis, bien commentés et bien discutés. Les effets de la taxe sur les secteurs de l'économie, les ménages et le gouvernement sont bien expliqués.)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(La conclusion est bien structure. Elle revient sur les objectifs, la méthodologie et synthétise bien les résultats obtenus. Des implications ou leçons de politiques économique ont également été formulées par les auteurs sur la base des résultats obtenus)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Les références sont compréhensibles et appropriées. Relire les références afin de corriger certaines fautes et erreurs de frappe. Certains titres sont écrits en italiques d'autres non. Respecter la même forme)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an 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):**

L'article est bien élaboré dans l'ensemble. La prise en compte de ces quelques remarques devrait permettre d'améliorer le document. I propose the following wording for greater clarity of the subject and conformity with the content of the text "*Impact of a cashew export tax on economic activity, household incomes and government revenues in Senegal: an application using a dynamic computable general equilibrium model*". Donner la signification certains paramètres et variables dans la spécification des modèles. Relire les références afin de corriger certaines fautes et erreurs de frappe. Pour les références, certains titres sont écrits en italiques d'autres non.

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

**L'article est bien présenté et publiable.**

# ***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: Prof Greg E .EDAME	
University/Country: Department of Economics, University of Calabar, Calabar-Nigeria.	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/02/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 08/02/2022
Manuscript Title: Impact of a Cashew nut trade policy on household and Government Revenue in Senegal: An application using a Dynamic Computable General Equilibrium Model.	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>I suggest the title should now read: Impact of Cashew nut Trade policy on household and Government Revenues in Senegal: A Dynamic Computable General Equilibrium Model Analysis.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4 Very Good</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The Abstract clearly presents the objective, methodology and results of the findings. Some of the results reported on 3.2.1-3.2.5 in figures and percentages should be reported on the Abstract equally.</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4 Very Good</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Yes, there are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in the article and on the Abstract of the paper which need to be corrected. The authors should do a good edition of the paper.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The methodology adopted is very clear and well explained.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The results are clear and well explained.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4 Very Good</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The conclusion is accurate and supported by the content. The authors should however include policy recommendations.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5 Excellent</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>The references are very up to date and comprehensive as well as appropriate.</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):**

- Should create a column for policy recommendations of the paper after the conclusion as 5. Policy recommendations.
- Expand the policy recommendations since what you have here is very scanty.
- Where citation of authors is used for the first time is more than one, the names of all the authors should be listed and upon subsequent citation of the same authors then, et al , can be used but not upon first citation as the authors have adopted here in their paper.

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

The paper good for publication in the journal and should be accepted with minor revision as indicated above in the paper.