EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute ESI
10 YEARS

Paper: **"Analyse des Déterminants de la Connaissance de l'Assurance Agricole par les Agriculteurs de la Commune de Dassa Zoumé"**

Submitted: 16 August 2023
Accepted: 09 November 2023
Published: 30 November 2023

Corresponding Author: Morest Agossadou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n31p11

Peer review:

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

Reviewer 2: Alain Togbédji Aguida
Université de Parakou, Bénin

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Le thème est à revoir.
Le contenu n'aborde pas l'aspect genre
Proposition de thème :

« Analyse des déterminants de la connaissance de l'assurance agricole par les agriculteurs de la commune de Dassa zoumé »

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

C'est ok

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

Oui quelques erreurs sont relevées en suivi de modification dans la version corrigée ci-jointe

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Pas assez clair. Plusieurs suggestions faites dans la version révisée ci-jointe

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

Oui juste que quelques révisions de forme en suivi de modification dans la version révisée

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

ok pour ça

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

ok pour ça

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

3

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]

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):

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: KOUAKOU KOUAKOU PAUL-ALFRED	
University/Country: Ivory Coast	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **Analyse genre-sensible des connaissances des agriculteurs de l'assurance agricole en zone vulnérable aux changements climatiques.**	
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.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
CLEAR	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
GOOD BUT IMPROVE THE LEVEL OF LANGUAGE	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
IMPROVE THE LEVEL OF WRITING	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
GOOD BUT IMPROVE THE LEVEL OF LANGUAGE AND WRITING	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
GOOD BUT IMPROVE THE LEVEL OF LANGUAGE AND WRITING	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
VERY SHORT. IMPROVE	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
ACCEPTABLE	

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):

ACCEPTABLE BUT IMPROVE THE LEVEL OF LANGUAGE AND WRITING (GRAMMAR, CONJUGATION)

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ACCEPTABLE BUT IMPROVE THE LEVEL OF LANGUAGE AND WRITING (GRAMMAR, CONJUGATION)