

Paper: “Dynamique des Ressources Humaines, Animales, et Naturelles au cours des 32 dernières années (1990-2022) dans la Zone de Fakara de Sud-Ouest du Niger”

Submitted: 27 March 2024

Accepted: 17 July 2024

Published: 31 July 2024

Corresponding Author: Ousmane Kansaye

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n21p106

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Silue Pagadjovongo Adama
Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Mokea Niaty Aurelien
Université des Sciences et Techniques de Masuku Franceville, Gabon

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Pas de commentaire pour le titre

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Au niveau de l'abstract, j'ai apporté quelques modifications, les auteurs doivent tenir compte des recommandations.

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

Il y a peu de fautes grammaticales

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

La méthodologie n'est pas clairement énoncée, les auteurs doivent tenir compte des recommandations et des questions posées au niveaux du manuscrit.

Chaque résultat obtenu doit être lié à une méthodologie.

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

Certains résultats sont présentés en paragraphe et cela pose problème. Avant ou après tout commentaire, les résultats doivent être traduits en tableau ou figure avec des chiffres ou pas. Les auteurs doivent tenir compte des recommandations et des questions posées au niveaux du manuscrit à la section.

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

La conclusion n'est pas bien présentée, elle ne présente pas les grands résultats obtenus et n'énonce pas des perspectives. Une conclusion n'est pas le lieu de commenter vos résultats. Vous devez être capable de répondre à la question au sortir de cette étude qu'est ce qu'on retient en général?

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Les auteurs doivent tenir compte des recommandations des instructions aux auteurs.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Les auteurs doivent tenir compte des recommandations proposés dans ce manuscrit pour l'améliorer. Revoir la partie "Matériel et Méthodes", Résultats et Discussion ainsi que la Conclusion.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: SILUE Pagadjovongo Adama	
University/Country: Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly/Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/06/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/06/2024
Manuscript Title: Dynamique des ressources au cours des 32 dernières années [1990-2022] dans la zone de FAKARA (Sud-Ouest du Niger)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 19.04.2024	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Oui	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Oui You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Oui	

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
Le titre reflète le contenu de l'article	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
Le résumé est bien structuré mais la partie résultats mérite d'être étoffée avec les principaux résultats obtenus.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

L'article contient des fautes grammaticales et d'orthographe mineurs qu'il faudra corriger	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
La méthode d'étude est bien énoncée mais mérite quelques précisions sur les approches d'échantillonnage (approches quantitative et qualitative)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
Les résultats sont clairement exposés mais contient de petites confusions et fautes d'orthographe qu'il faudra corriger. Certains résultats méritent d'être illustrés par des graphiques.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
(La conclusion est bien rédigée et reflète le contenu de l'article.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Renseigner davantage sur les références, et les présenter selon le modèle recommandé par le Journal	

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):

Le manuscrit doit être strictement uniforme (taille et police) et conforme au format de la revue EJS.

L'Introduction doit situer l'intérêt de votre travail, les enjeux et poser la problématique, en étayant vos propos par des références récentes et issues de périodiques (revues ou journaux spécialisés).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 4/06/24	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Dynamique des ressources au cours des 32 dernières années [1990-2022] dans la zone de FAKARA (Sud-Ouest du Niger)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0419/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.	2.5
<i>(The title is not very clearly and adequate to the content of the article)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>(The abstract is clearly presents objects and methods)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2.5
<i>(There are many grammar and vocabulary mistakes)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(The study methods are clearly explained)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(The results are not clear and contain much errors)</i>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3.5
<i>(The conclusion are accurate and supported by the content)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(The references are not comprehensive and not appropriate)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Author must take into account these observations to improve the document

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: