

**Paper: “Dynamique d’Utilisation des Terres (1991-2023) des Plantations d’Anacarde dans la Zone Soudano-Guinéenne du Centre Bénin”**

**Submitted: 24 October 2023**

**Accepted: 23 December 2023**

**Published: 31 December 2023**

Corresponding Author: Alain Abi-Kaberou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n35p134](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n35p134)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Laurent Lamulle  
University of Parakou, Parakou, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Ousmane Ndiaye  
ENSA/Université Iba Der Thiam de Thies, Senegal

-----  
Reviewer I:

Recommendation: See Comments  
-----

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

the title is clear and adapted to the context

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

yes it has the different partthe

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

the few grammatical mistake were put in red colour

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

the methods are explained clearly

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

yes

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

the hypothesis must focus on the the changes of soil occupation throught the periode  
but not on the policy .Your are not studying the policy.

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

the references are well done

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*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]

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):**

the independant test must show link of the soil occupation to the period as shown in red!!

-----  
-----  
Reviewer K:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

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

Yes, just remove nut from english version

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

Good, small changes in english version

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

Yes, just Check the paper

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes, good

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

Good, small things to be corrected

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

Yes, Good

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

Good

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

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

5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

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

5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

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

5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

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

5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

Just small observations. Very Good paper.

-----