

Paper: "Impact of Swollen Shoot Disease on the Livelihoods of Smallholder Cocoa Farmers in Côte d'Ivoire"

Submitted: 20 October 2022 Accepted: 17 December 2022 Published: 31 December 2022

Corresponding Author: Wenceslas AFFESSI

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p58

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jean Luc Dit B Nsouandele

Reviewer 2: 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!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Impact of swollen shoot disease on the livelihoods of cocoa smallholder farmers in Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
(Please insert your comments)Just one word to add on he title	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
(Please insert your comments)	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
(Please insert your comments) See document	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
(Please insert your comments)	

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):

The msnuscript is ready to be published but minor revison should be taken into consideration

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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:	Date Review Report Submitted:	
Manuscript Title: Impact of swollen shoot disease on the livelihoods of smallholder cocoa farmers in Côte d'Ivoire.		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 15-20.11.2022		
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	It is OK
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
(Please insert your comments) more details should be added for results (percentage, quota), and a french version is needed	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	

(Please insert your comments)	
Yes, in the body of the work (results and methods) there are g mistaskes.	rammatical
put the title of figure 1 below figure 1	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
(Please insert your comments) Methods are well presented, just to correct language.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
(Please insert your comments) There a dilemma of language and some results (quota) need to	more discussed.
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
(Please insert your comments) Good	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
(Please insert your comments) Well done	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	✓ OK
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: