

Paper: “Typologie des Exploitations Agricoles Familiales et Technologie de Rouissage de Manioc: Cas des exploitations de la Commune de Maluku, en République Démocratique du Congo”

Submitted: 05 September 2022

Accepted: 27 April 2023

Published: 30 April 2023

Corresponding Author: Moise Lufuluabo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n11p85](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n11p85)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kouakou Kouakou Paul-Alfred
Peleforo Gon Coulibaly University, Ivory Coast

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: PROFESSOR KOUAKOU KOUAKOU PAUL-ALFRED	
University/Country: PELEFORO GON COULIBALY UNIVERSITY – IVORY COAST	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/03/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/03/2023
Manuscript Title: Typologie des exploitations agricoles familiales et technologie de rouissage de manioc : cas des exploitations de la commune de Maluku, en République Démocratique du Congo	
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>	<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>(Good)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract does not include the essential results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>some mistakes to consider</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Good)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Good but some mistakes)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Good and clear)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(good but needs to be harmonised)</i>	

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):

Suggestions should be taken into account to improve the quality of the document

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This document has an interesting scientific content. It can be published if the criticisms are taken into account.