

Paper: “Analyse de l’Efficacité Économique des Systèmes de Culture du Riz en Bas-fonds dans la Commune de Malanville, au Nord-Benin”

Submitted: 22 January 2023

Accepted: 27 April 2023

Published: 30 April 2023

Corresponding Author: Josué Y. Gouwakinnou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n10p169](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n10p169)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Soro Kouhana

University Peleforo Gon Coulibaly Korhogo, Cote d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Maurice Dasyva

Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor, Sénégal

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: Maurice DASYLVA	
University/Country: Sénégal	
Date Manuscript Received: 24 mars 2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Efficacité économique des systèmes de culture du riz en bas-fonds dans la commune de Malanville, au Nord-Benin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0214/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. <input type="checkbox"/> 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes. <input type="checkbox"/> 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.	4,5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le la problématique et le contexte pose dans le résumé doivent être reformulés afin qu'ils cadre avec la substance de la thématique analysée. Quelque erreurs de syntaxe doivent être corrigées.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les auteurs devront prendre en compte les coquilles et erreurs de syntaxes dans le documents	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Quelques precisions et réarrangements à apporter	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Trés prolifiques dans la présentation des résultats et une tendance à aborder les éléments de discussion dans les résultats	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Susciente et claire	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Bien présenté</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):

Voir les commentaires en suivi et modification dans l'article.

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: SORO KOUHANA	
University/Country: University Peleforo Gon Coulibaly Korhogo / Cote- d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/3/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/04/2023
Manuscript Title: Efficacité économique des systèmes de culture du riz en bas-fonds dans la commune de Malanville, au Nord-Benin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0214/23	
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> Analyse Efficacité économique des systèmes de culture du riz en bas-fonds dans la commune de Malanville, au Nord-Benin. L'étude consiste à faire une analyse comparative de l'efficacité des systèmes de culture.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Adéquation entre le titre et les objectifs.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Utiliser le passé composé ou l'imparfait	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Revoir la présentation de la méthodologie	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Revoir l'analyse et la discussion	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Bonne conclusion	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Références appropriées.	

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):

Introduction trop longue.

Revoir la présentation de Matériel et Méthodes, l'analyse et la discussion.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No comments