



Paper: “Contribution des pratiques agroécologiques au développement des exploitations familiales dans la Commune de Notto Diobass au Sénégal”

Submitted: 21 November 2024

Accepted: 11 January 2025

Published: 31 January 2025

Corresponding Author: Mamadou Moustapha Mbaye

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n1p208

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oumar Bah
Sup' Management, Mali

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: Dr Oumar BAH Maître Assistant du CAMES	
University/Country: Sup'Management - Mali	
Date Manuscript Received: 08/01/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 08/01/2025
Manuscript Title: Contribution des pratiques agroécologiques au développement des exploitations familiales dans la Commune de Notto Diobass au Sénégal	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 07 17-12-2024	
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: 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>Le titre s'accorde avec le contenu</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>Le résumé présente bien les objets, la méthode et les résultats de l'étude</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>L'article à besoin d'être relu pour corriger les fautes d'orthographe</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>La méthodologie de l'étude est très bien présentée</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Les résultats de l'étude sont clairement présentés et ne souffrent pas d'erreurs</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>La conclusion et le résumé sont appropriés</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Les références bibliographiques sont appropriées bien qu'un peu anciennes</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):

L'article doit être revu par une personne neutre pour corriger les fautes d'accord.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: