

Paper: “Impact de la Variabilité Climatique sur les Calendriers Agricoles dans la Sous-prefecture de Vavoua (Centre-Ouest Ivoirien)”

Submitted: 12 February 2022

Accepted: 27 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Aka Giscard Adou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p255](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p255)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Sylla Daouda
Université FHB de Cocody-Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Kanga Kouakou Hermann
Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire

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: SYLLA Daouda	
University/Country; Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 18 Février 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 25 Février 2022
Manuscript Title: Impact of climate variability on agricultural activities in the Vavoua sub-prefecture (center-west ivorian)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 69.02.2022	
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>I think, the title is clear and adequate to the content of the article as this article deals with the impacts of climate variability and climate change on agricultural activities in the sub-prefecture of Vavoua</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Authors must clearly specify the concepts of climate variability and climate change. By my point of view, their methods and results seem clear. But, authors must review their summary in order to maintain consistency in the methodological approach</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3.5
<i>I have corrected and suggested in the text some indications for the grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. I suggest the authors to take them into account.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>In my point of view, the study method is explained clearly.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>As far as I'm concerned, the results seem clear and do not contain errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3.5
<i>If the conclusion is accurate, I think, the authors have to rewrite their summary in order to well adjust it to the article's content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>From my point of view, I think this article's references are comprehensive and appropriate.</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):

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: 24/02/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 02/03/2022
Manuscript Title: IMPACT DE LA VARIABILITE CLIMATIQUE SUR LES ACTIVITES AGRICOLES DANS LA SOUS-PREFECTURE DE VAVOUA (CENTRE-OUEST IVOIRIEN)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 69.0222	
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.	3

<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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<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	<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):

Les commentaries et suggestions se retrouvent dans le documents.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: