

Paper: **“Habitudes Alimentaires au Niger : Cartographie des Recettes Culinaires des Ménages”**

Submitted: 17 May 2022

Accepted: 22 July 2022

Published: 31 July 2022

Corresponding Author: Aichatou Alirou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n24p223](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n24p223)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Lrhorfi Lalla Aicha
Ibn Tofail, Maroc

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: LRHORFI Lalla Aicha	
University/Country: Ibn Tofail/Maroc	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/06/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 18/06/22
Manuscript Title: Habitudes Alimentaires au Niger : Cartographie des Recettes Culinaires des Ménages	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0553/22	
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>(Please insert your 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>Le travail est bien rédigé</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Il manque des traitements (Méthodes) statistiques</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>L'auteur n'a pas bien exploité les données. Et il doit établir un lien entre les différentes paramètres et de mettre en valeur l'effet de ces régimes alimentaires sur la santé</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>Les references sont mal rédigées, (à les écrire de la même façon)</i>	

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):

Etablir un lien entre les différentes variances avec des méthodes statistiques et mettre en valeur l'effet de ces régimes alimentaires sur la santé

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: