

**Paper: “La Culture Attelée: un Progrès dans les Méthodes de Production Agricole aux Incidences Agro-pédologiques et Socio-éducatives Néfastes dans la Sous-préfecture de Sirasso (Nord-Côte d’Ivoire)”**

**Submitted: 23 August 2022**

**Accepted: 23 December 2022**

**Published: 31 December 2022**

Corresponding Author: Yéo Nogodji Jean

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n39p108](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n39p108)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kopeg Jean-Louis Assi  
Université Jean Lorougnon Guede de Daloa, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Kpassi Seme  
University of Lomé, Togo

# ***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: 14/12/2022	Date Review Report Submitted : 18/12/2022
<b>Manuscript Title : La Culture Attelée : un Progrès dans les Méthodes de Production Agricole aux Incidences Agro-pédologiques et Socio-éducatives Néfastes dans la Sous-préfecture de Sirasso</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Yes	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

Yes	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
Some errors of synthaxe and sentences sometimes long. In addition, there are sentences without conjugated verbs in the body of the article.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
Acceptable	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
Acceptable	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
Acceptable	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
Yes	

**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):**

The subject is quite well developed by the author. However, at the level of the syntax, there are long sentences and without verbs conjugated in places. This makes the text difficult to understand at times.

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

# ***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: ASSI Kopeh Jean-Louis	
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guede de Daloa (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: La Culture Attelée: un Progrès dans les Méthodes de Production Agricole aux Incidences Agro-pédologiques et Socio-éducatives Néfastes dans la Sous-préfecture de Sirasso	
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>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>Le titre est en adéquation avec le contenu de l'article cependant nous y avons proposé une reformulation.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Le résumé présente clairement les objets, la démarche méthodologique et les principaux résultats obtenus.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Le manuscrit présente peu de coquilles. Ce qui démontre de la rigueur rédactionnelle de l'auteur.)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(la démarche méthodologique utilisée est appropriée pour les résultats obtenus cependant quelques aspects doivent être renforcés.)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Les résultats sont clairement mis en exergue toutefois quelques précisions sont à apportées.)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Le résumé reflète le contenu de l'étude cependant la conclusion doit être tout autant.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Les références méthodologiques utilisées sont appropriées et abondantes.)</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):**

L'auteur devra prendre en compte les remarques faites en vue de renforcer le manuscrit.

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