



Paper: “Analyse financière des systèmes de production du Riz dans la région de GAO”

Submitted: 26 March 2025

Accepted: 26 May 2025

Published: 30 June 2025

Corresponding Author: Boubacar Dicko

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n16p196

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Olouhitin Mouléro Franck Ronald Adjobo
Université de Paraou, Benin

Reviewer 2: Agani Oloni Alain
Université Nationale d’Agriculture, Benin

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: AGANI Oloni Alain	
University/Country: Université Nationale d'Agriculture, Benin	
Date Manuscript Received: 22 April 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 6 May 2025
Manuscript Title: Analysis of rice production systems in the GAO region	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0434/25	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
(Please insert your comments) Le titre es en accord avec le texte mais il est écrit en anglais alors que le texte est en français.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
(Please insert your comments) Absence de résumé en français quand bien même le manuscrit est rédigé en français.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
(Please insert your comments)	

Il y a beaucoup de fautes dans le manuscrit. Il mérite une relecture approfondie pour la correction des fautes de grammaire, de conjugaison et d'orthographe. Certaines phrases ne sont pas compréhensibles. Beaucoup de sigles non définis dans le texte, etc.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthodologie mérite d'être mieux clarifiée. La formule de la détermination de l'échantillon doit être clarifiée et référencée. La formule utilisée pour calculer le ratio coût bénéfice et son interprétation possible. La clarification du revenu net et de la rentabilité mérite d'être faite. Lorsque la méthodologie est attaquée, le document s'effondre. Donc il faut revoir correctement la méthodologie.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résultat n'est bien discuté. La discussion s'est adossée sur trois (03) références bibliographiques seulement. Très peu d'articles scientifiques ont été utilisés dans le manuscrit.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La conclusion est en lien avec le document. Comme le manuscrit doit subir de profondes modifications, la conclusion devra être reprise après cela.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La référence bibliographique aussi bien dans le texte qu'à la fin du manuscrit doit être reprise. Il doit respecter les normes en la matière.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Le thème est d'actualité. En effet, la sécurité alimentaire et la lutte contre la pauvreté passent par une amélioration des systèmes de production. Il faut alors traiter le sujet avec toute la rigueur scientifique qu'il requiert. Votre publication vous suit pour toute votre vie.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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. Ir. Olouhitin Mouléro Franck Ronald ADJOBO	
University/Country: Université de Paraou/Benin	
Date Manuscript Received: 22/04/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/05/2025
Manuscript Title: Analysis of rice production systems in the GAO region	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0434/25	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>The title must be revised to specify that the authors are discussing financial analysis.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The abstract specifies the object, methods, and results. The authors need to elaborate on the methods and summarize the results further.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>The paper needs to be read and corrected.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The authors must give a more detailed explanation of the methods.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3

<i>The results contain errors that must be corrected.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion is correct</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>We need more references for this paper</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): The topic is good, but the paper needs some additional focus.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: /