

YEARS

Submitted: 06 June 2024 Accepted: 07 July 2024 Published: 31 July 2024

Corresponding Author: Christian Duhamel Logozo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n19p181

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yeboah Evans Nanjing University of Science and Technology, China

Reviewer 2: Robert Szucs University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer A: Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract presents the object, methods, and results. However, the policy recommendation part is vague.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. Some grammatical errors need to be corrected in the article.

Some grammatical errors need to be corrected in the articl

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods are clearly explained. However, the authors' arrangement of the methods should follow some standards. Firstly, right after introducing the methods, the next subtitle should be data collection, a description of the variables before the main model equations.

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

The body of the paper is clear but the authors need to check for a few grammatical errors.

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

The conclusion is adequate and supported by the content. However, the policy implication must be statements specific in the conclusion. The study limitations need to be provided by the authors.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are comprehensive and appropriate

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]

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):

My suggestion is that the literature review be separated from the production. It is because it doesn't make the introduction very simple and coherent.

Reviewer B: Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title "Do climate shocks disadvantage household investment in human capital in Benin? An approach based on the endogenous treatment regression model" is clear, concise, and accurately reflects the content of the article. It immediately informs the reader about the geographic focus (Benin), the main subject (climate shocks and household investment in human capital), and the methodological approach (endogenous treatment regression model).

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract effectively outlines the objective of the study, the methodology (use of a linear regression model of endogenous treatment), and summarizes the key findings. However, it could be improved by providing a bit more detail on the data used and the specific results of the analysis for a clearer overview.

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

The article contains minimal grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. The language is mostly clear and professional. However, a few minor typographical errors are present, which do not significantly hinder understanding but could be improved with a thorough proofreading.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods section is detailed and well-explained, including the empirical model, definition of variables, estimation strategies, and data sources. The use of a linear regression model with endogenous treatment effects is thoroughly described, making it easy for readers to understand and replicate the study.

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

The results are presented clearly, with detailed tables and figures that effectively illustrate the findings. The statistical analysis is robust, and the interpretation of the results is logical and well-argued.

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

The conclusions are well-supported by the data and analysis presented in the article. They accurately reflect the findings and discuss the implications of the results in a

3

meaningful way, providing valuable insights into the impact of climate shocks on household investment in human capital in Benin.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are comprehensive, relevant, and up-to-date. They cover a wide range of sources pertinent to the study's topic, including foundational texts and recent research, which provides a solid background and context for the study.

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] 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper. [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] 5

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):