

Paper: “La Résilience des Exploitations d’Eleveurs dans un Contexte de Changement Climatique dans la Région de Thiès”

Submitted: 12 October 2023

Accepted: 15 November 2023

Published: 30 November 2023

Corresponding Author: Mamadou Moustapha Mbaye

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n33p76](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n33p76)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Thierry Monnet
Université de Montréal (QC), Canada

Reviewer 2: Nouhoun Zoumarou Wallis
Université de Parakou, République du Bénin

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:	
University/Country: Université de Montréal (QC) Canada	
Date Manuscript Received: 2023-10-22	Date Review Report Submitted: 2023-11-05
Manuscript Title: La résilience des exploitations d'éleveurs dans un contexte de changement climatique dans la région de Thiès.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1054/23	
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>	

The title is clear, and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. A few grammatical correction needs.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Authors can find them in the manuscript.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study methods are explained clearly. However, they have to clearly define the resource persons other than the breeders who were mentioned in the interview.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Authors can find them in the manuscript.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Even though, the conclusion is well argued from the beginning. However, the last paragraph does not show a future perspective on the subject. A document link is provided in the manuscript on the established impact of livestock farming on the environment.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Authors may also find the suggested corrections in the manuscript.	

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):

I would like to congratulate the authors on their work, which is of a high scientific standard. A few corrections may help to finalize this article.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

It delighted me to review this well-made study.

Thanks for the ongoing collaboration.

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: ZOUMAROU WALLIS Nouhoun	
University/Country: Université de Parakou – République du Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 09-11-2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: La résilience des exploitations d'éleveurs dans un contexte de changement climatique dans la région de Thiès.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1054/23	
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.	3

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
No comments	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>This abstract is too long</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: