

Paper: “Approche Strategique pour Rentabilite Economique du Coton dans la Commune de Banikoara au Benin: la Cuma comme une Response Alternative?”

Submitted: 29 March 2022

Accepted: 08 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Emile Aifa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n25p48

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hakim Karib

Institut Agronomique et Vétérinaire Hassan II, Rabat, Maroc

Reviewer 2: Zoumarou Wallis Nouhoun

Université de Parakou, Bénin

Reviewer 3: Papy Bonkena Bokombola

Universiy of Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of Congo

Reviewer 4: 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: 26 avril 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 11 mai 2022
Manuscript Title: APPROCHE STRATEGIQUE POUR UNE RENTABILITE ECONOMIQUE DU COTON DANS LA COMMUNE DE BANIKOARA AU BENIN: LA CUMA COMME UNE REPONSE ALTERNATIVE?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0420/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

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
Le titre est clair et concis et met bien en valeur le contenu de l'étude	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<p>Au niveau résumé, l'auteur met en exergue le rôle socio-économique très important de la filière production du coton et l'intérêt de la rentabilité économique pour les producteurs au Benin, considéré comme premier pays producteur du coton en Afrique.</p> <p>Il présente de manière claire l'objectif visé par l'étude dans un contexte d'investissement en matériel de production, la méthode utilisée comme modèle économique et les résultats obtenus.</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<p>Le manuscrit est globalement bien rédigé, clair, et facile à lire.</p> <p>Je peux toutefois regretter la présence de quelques erreurs de police, de style qui nécessitent d'être rectifiées.</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p>Dans la partie expérimentale, Les variables et concepts choisis pour l'étude sont décrits distinctement et de manière appropriée selon la question posée. Les méthodes employées sont énoncées en détail directement et par références à la littérature.</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<p>Les résultats sont relatés avec précision. Les tableaux sont efficacement exploités. La section se limite à la présentation et l'analyse des résultats trouvés en rapport avec l'amélioration du seuil de rentabilité pour les différents groupes de producteurs de coton. Les discussions ont été conduites avec la rigueur scientifique requise. Elles donnent aussi le lien entre les constats obtenus et les connaissances décrites dans la revue de littérature</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<p>Les conclusions révélées sont en accord avec la problématique énoncée sans dépasser les limites de la présente recherche.</p> <p>Elles ont mis le point sur les principaux résultats à retenir du travail de recherche.</p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<p>Le nombre de références est raisonnable; chacune d'elle apporte un éclairage particulier. Elles sont globalement présentées selon les règles admises de rédaction dans le texte et la bibliographie.</p> <p>Certaines références méritent d'être revues.</p>	

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):

- En vue d'améliorer la présentation de cette soumission, je suggère d'y apporter des modifications, jugées mineures. L'ensemble de ces modifications ont été apportées directement dans le texte (voir manuscrit révisé).

- Revoir et compléter les références bibliographiques suivantes: Agba (2001); AIC (2008); Lares Apeif (1995); Ficou (2017); Yegbemey et Tokpon (2020); Crole-Rees et Bio Goura (2001); Blein *et al.* (2013); Balse *et al.* (2015)

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!

Reviewer Name: ZOUMAROU WALLIS Nouhoun	
University/Country: Université de Parakou / Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/07/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/07/2022
Manuscript Title: Approche stratégique pour une rentabilité économique du coton dans la commune de Banikoara au Bénin : la CUMA comme une réponse alternative ?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0420/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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.	5
<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 am not an agro economic specialist</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> <i>Some affirmations are not supported by sources</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!

Reviewer Name: Papy Bonkena Bokombola	
University/Country: University of Kinshasa/ Democratic Republic of Congo	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/07/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/08/2022
Manuscript Title: Strategic approach of economic profitability of cotton in the municipality of Banikoara in Benin: CUAE as an alternative response?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 20.04.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/ No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/ No	

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.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: