EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute ESI
10 YEARS

Paper: **"Perceptions Paysannes et Caractérisation de la Motorisation des Exploitations Agricoles dans la Commune de Kétou"**

**Submitted: 07 May 2023**
**Accepted: 12 July 2023**
**Published: 31 July 2023**

Corresponding Author: Pierre Ouassa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n19p124

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Pocoun Damè Kombienou
Institut National des Recherches Agricoles du Bénin

---
Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

---

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Le titre est acceptable. Toutefois, il est approprié d'ajouter le pays. Les futurs lecteurs ne savent pas où est situé Kétou. Le titre doit pousser les lecteurs de vous lire (cf. manuscrit révisé).

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Oui, cependant les implications politiques sont absentes.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Oui, quelques fautes d'inattention.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Oui, mais consulté le manuscrit révisé pour quelques éclaircies.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Quelques erreurs mineurs.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Oui, cependant les auteurs doivent ajouter les implications politiques et les limites de l'étude.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Plus ou moins, les auteurs doivent utiliser les outils comme Zotero ou EndNote ou encore Mendeley pour une bibliographie claire et appréciable. De plus, les auteurs utilisent des anciennes références. Pour un impact significatif, ils doivent utiliser les auteurs d'au moins sept ans d'ancienneté à compter du jour de la soumission du présent travail pour révision par les pairs.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Les commentaires sont contenus dans le manuscrit en track-change.

---

---
Reviewer V:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

---

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

yes

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

yes

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

yes

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

yes

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

yes

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

yes

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

consider all comments and refer back to the journal.

---

---
Reviewer W:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

---

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

oui

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The summary is too long.
the methods are not very clear and there is still work to be done

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Minor faults

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Not very clear
and the one used are not too adapted to the context

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

He still has a lot of effort to make to make a good document

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

No

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] **1**-**5** [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The document must be reworked in its entirety it will take a little more effort from the authors

---