

**Paper: “Perceptions and Characterization of Local Knowledge on Soil Fertility Management by Maize Farmers in Central Benin”**

**Submitted: 18 July 2023**

**Accepted: 24 August 2023**

**Published: 31 October 2023**

Corresponding Author: Codjo Jacques Houndete

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n30p13](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n30p13)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Josephus van der Maesen  
Wageningen University, Netherlands

Reviewer 2: Félix Kouelo Alladassi  
Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, Benin

-----  
Reviewer ]:

Recommendation: See Comments  
-----

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

The title describes clearly the items researched from maize farmers in a particular area of Benin.

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

The 1248 maize farmers from two areas in central Benin consider in majority that application of chemical fertilizer is the reason for declining soil fertility. The statistical methods are described which lead to this results, and the obvious other techniques need to be explained by extension agents. The modalities of the farmers such as age and gender, education are characteristics found in the results.

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

The write-up of this paper has remarkably few grammatical errors. Spelling mistakes are few too, barring several spelling errors in Latin plant names (see corrections in the Word version I attach. Punctuation and accents are present and need to be corrected.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Descriptive statistics and multivariate analysis were employed and explained clearly.

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

The build-up of the article is logic, albeit somewhat verbose, I could not detect mistakes.

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

The brief conclusion is clear and helpful in getting the message through.

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

Some references are listed that do not occur as citation in the text:

Amsalu

Asfaw

Dessie

MAEP

Zinzindohoué

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

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

3

*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]

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

Some remnants of the French remain, Fig. 5 is difficult to comprehend. What is biochar?

-----

-----  
Reviewer f:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

The title is clear and appropriate, but it needs to be reworded.  
Title proposition: Perceptions and characterization of local knowledge on soil fertility management by maize farmers in central Benin.

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

Yes

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

Yes, grammatical errors and spelling mistakes are reported in tracking mode in the manuscript

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes, the study methods are clear.

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

The few errors in the presentation of the results were reported in tracking mode in the manuscript

**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]

3

*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):**

Integrate corrections in manuscript tracking mode

-----